



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



HARVARD
COLLEGE
LIBRARY

0

CORRESPONDENCE

CONCERNING

CLAIMS AGAINST GREAT BRITAIN.

TRANSMITTED TO THE

Dept. of State.
SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES —

IN ANSWER TO THE

RESOLUTIONS OF DECEMBER 4 AND 10, 1867, AND OF MAY 27, 1868.

—
VOLUME I.
—

c
WASHINGTON:
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE,
1869.

US 6344.5.5 (1)

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT.

To the Senate of the United States:

In answer to the resolution of the Senate of the 27th of May last, in relation to the subject of claims against Great Britain, I transmit a report from the Secretary of State, and the papers which accompanied it.

U. S. GRANT.

WASHINGTON, April 7, 1869.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, April 7, 1869.

The Secretary of State, to whom was referred the resolution of the Senate of the 27th of May, 1868, requesting that, if not inconsistent with the public interest, copies of all negotiations and correspondence between the British government and the government of the United States in relation to what are commonly called the Alabama claims may be furnished to that body, has the honor to lay before the President the papers called for by the resolution.

The department had, under the resolutions adopted by the Senate on the 4th and 10th of December, 1867, made such progress as the pressure of current business and the limited clerical force would permit in the preparation of indexes of all the papers relating to the subject of claims against Great Britain, and they are included in this report for the convenience of the Senate.

Respectfully submitted:

HAMILTON FISH.

The PRESIDENT.

PAPERS

RELATING TO

CLAIMS AGAINST GREAT BRITAIN.

RECOGNITION OF REBEL BELLIGERENCY.

RECOGNITION OF REBEL BELLIGERENCY BY GREAT BRITAIN AND FRANCE.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
304	Mr. Black to Mr. Dallas.	1861. Feb. 28	Election of Abraham Lincoln to be President. Formation of self-styled Confederate States of America. Instructs him to use such means as may, in his judgment, be proper and necessary to prevent the success of the agents of the seceding States in their efforts to obtain recognition of their independence by the government of Great Britain.	7
Cir.	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dallas.	Mar. 9	Refers to dispatch 304 of Mr. Black. Reiterates instruction. Incloses President Lincoln's inaugural, declaring the acts of secession void, and the purpose of the Union to constitutionally defend and maintain itself	8
325	Mr. Dallas to Mr. Seward.	Mar. 22	In an interview he expressed to Lord Russell the opposition that dispatch 304 instructed him to make to any recognition of the insurgents by the Queen. No definite conclusion as to action yet reached in British cabinet. No emissary from insurgent government yet arrived, though expected.	10
	Lord Russell to Mr. Dallas.	Mar. 21	Incloses for Mr. Dallas's perusal draught of proposed dispatch, and asks if Mr. Black's request is correctly represented therein.	10
	Mr. Dallas to Lord Russell.	Mar. 21	Replies that Mr. Black is correctly represented.	10
	Lord Russell to Lord Lyons.	Mar. 22	States substance of Mr. Black's 304, and remarks that if the separation had been acknowledged as right, her Majesty's government would have seen it with great concern; that the opposition of the United States to the separation would make British government very reluctant to take any steps which might encourage or sanction it, but the British government could not be bound to any particular course.	11
329	Mr. Dallas to Mr. Seward.	April 5	Acknowledges Nos. 306 and 307. Lord Russell's absence from town prevents interview. Commissioners from insurgents not yet arrived. Will convey Mr. Seward's views to British government upon first opportunity.	11
330 do	April 9	An interview obtained for submission of circular of March 9. Lord Russell assures him that there was not the slightest disposition in the British government to grasp	12

RECOGNITION BY GREAT BRITAIN AND FRANCE—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
		1861.	at advantages which might arise from domestic differences in the United States, and that it was not then in his power to say more. It is regarded proper to await arrival of Mr. Adams before finally discussing the question. Mr. Dallas promises vigilance. English opinion tends to approve peaceful separation. Proposition to be brought before House of Commons by Lord Alfred Churchill, and proposed pressure on the 15th for recognition by W. H. Gregory, of Galway.	
	Lord Russell to Lord Lyons.	April 12	Incloses Mr. Seward's circular of March 9. Recapitulates what he has communicated to Mr. Dallas as the views of her Majesty's government.	13
2	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	April 10	Debate between United States and England is confined to the San Juan boundary, and the extinguishment of the interest of Hudson Bay and Puget Sound Agricultural Companies. Organization of the self-styled Confederate States. Their probable efforts to obtain recognition by the British government, the success of which will terminate relations between United States and Great Britain. The differences between a true ground for recognition and that existing in the case of the insurgents. If recognized the United States will consider it a deliberate resolution by Great Britain that the Union shall be dissolved. The power of Great Britain for production requires peace in America. Her recognition of the insurgents would encourage perpetual war. Effect of introduction of new states into society of nations, and reasons for such admission. The precedent of precipitate action can be resorted to by dependencies of Great Britain. Reasons for friendship between the two nations.	13
	Proclamation.	April 15	President's call for 75,000 State militia to suppress rebellion and for the convening of Congress.	16
119	Mr. Faulkner to Mr. Seward.	April 15	Interview with Mr. Thouvenel, and submission of President's inaugural. Informs Mr. Thouvenel that whenever application for recognition shall be made by insurgents, it will be opposed by United States, and receives assurance that no such application has been made; that the Emperor will not take hasty action, but that <i>de facto</i> governments, under proper circumstances, have a right to recognition.	17
	Lord Lyons to Lord Russell.	April 22	Incloses copies of Jefferson Davis's proclamation inviting applications for letters of marque, and President Lincoln's proclamation declaring southern privateers pirates, and announcing blockade of southern ports. His proceedings in consequence thereof, and views thereon.	18
3	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.	April 22	Instruction to oppose appeal of insurgents to France for recognition. Impossibility of	19

RECOGNITION OF REBEL BELLIGERENCY.

III

NOTIFICATION OF BLOCKADE.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
		1861.		
4	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	April 27	admitting foreign intervention, and necessity for neutrality. Position of those governments which recognize the insurgents, toward the United States, and the incentive such recognition would be to defense of autonomy of the Union. Recapitulates substance of Mr. Dallas's 330, and instructs Mr. Adams to inform Lord Russell that the views of her Majesty's government communicated to Mr. Dallas are an indication of a policy injurious to the rights and derogating from the dignity of the United States.	20
5	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	June 7	Debate in Parliament on construction to be placed upon proclamation of neutrality. Preceding practice of Great Britain may permit retention of insurgent prizes in British ports until adjudicated upon in courts within insurgent jurisdiction. Motion of Mr. Gregory in Parliament for recognition.	390

NOTIFICATION OF BLOCKADE.

Cir.	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dallas.	1861. April 20	Communicating copy of proclamation denouncing southern privateers as pirates, and announcing blockade of southern ports.	20
	Proclamation.	April 27	Extending blockade to Virginia and North Carolina.	23
	Lord Lyons to Lord Russell.	April 27	Transmitting note of the 27th inst. from Mr. Seward, inclosing official copy of proclamation of blockade, and notifying him of intended extension.	23
	Do.....	May 2	Incloses acknowledgment of blockade proclamation, signifying his acceptance of the information as an announcement of an intention rather than as a fact.	24
	Do.....	May 4	States that Mr. Seward refrains from communicating the instructions issued to the blockading squadron, but assures him that it will be conducted according to recognized rules of public law.	25
	Do.....	May 11	Communicates correspondence with Mr. Seward in regard to actual beginning of blockade as affecting British vessels. States that no further information concerning blockade than that in dispatch of May 2 has reached him.	26
	Consul Bunch to Lord Russell.	May 15	Announcing the blockade of Charleston and vicinity by United States steamer Niagara.	27
	Lord Lyons to Lord Russell.	May 23	States that effective blockade of Pensacola existed on the 13th, but up to 16th no blockade existed at Mobile.	28
	Do.....	June 11	Incloses dispatch from Acting Consul Fullerton relative to establishment of blockade off Savannah.	28
	Do.....	June 11	Incloses dispatch from Acting Consul Magee	28

NOTIFICATION OF BLOCKADE—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
		1861.	announcing blockade of Mobile by United States steamer Powhatan.	
	Consul Lynn to Lord Russell.	July 3	Announcing blockade of Galveston by United States steamer South Carolina.	29
	Lord Lyons to Lord Russell.	July 29	Incloses postscript informing Lord Lyons of blockade of Galveston.	29
	Consul Bunch to Lord Russell.	July 25	Incloses proclamation of Flag-officer Pendergast, United States Navy, relative to blockade of ports of North Carolina.	31
	Notice.....	June 7	Notice of blockade of Appalachicola.....	31
4	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	May 31	Acknowledges receipt of printed circular of 27th April transmitting President's proclamation extending blockade to ports of Virginia and North Carolina.	32
6	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	May 27	Incloses note communicating to Mr. Thouvenel the President's proclamation extending blockade to ports of Virginia and North Carolina.	32
	Lord Russell to lords commissioners of the admiralty.	May 1	States that, as civil war between the northern and southern States of the American Union is imminent, and that as the president of the southern confederacy proposes to issue letters of marque against northern commerce, her Majesty's North American and West Indian squadron must be re-enforced, and that no preference must be shown for either party in the approaching contest by British naval forces.	33
333	Mr. Dallas to Mr. Seward.	May 2	States that motion of Mr. Gregory in House of Commons for recognition of insurgents which was postponed from 16th to 30th ult. has again been postponed a fortnight. Lord Russell invites an interview, and informs Mr. Dallas that three insurgent emissaries are in London; that he is not unwilling to see them unofficially; that there is an understanding as to similar course as to recognition between England and France. Refers to rumors of blockade but thinks well of waiting until the arrival of Mr. Adams before acting. The postponement of Mr. Gregory's motion depends upon Lord Russell's suggestion.	33
7	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.	May 4	Receipt of Mr. Faulkner's 117, 119, and 120 acknowledged. Instructions of President as communicated will be his guide. In reference to Mr. Faulkner's official conversation with M. Thouvenel, reported in 119, the latter gentleman must be assured of the complete harmony of the cabinet in regard to the rebellion and informed that the unofficial opinion expressed by Mr. Faulkner that a peaceable acquiescence in the claim of the insurgents to separate sovereignty does not represent the intention of the United States, which does not contemplate a dissolution of the Union.	34
	Lord Russell to Earl Cowley.	May 6	Instruction to say to Mr. Thouvenel that British government admit that the southern confederacy is entitled to be considered a belligerent and to be invested with cor	36

RECOGNITION OF REBEL BELLIGERENCY.

v

NOTIFICATION OF BLOCKADE—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
		1861.	responding rights and prerogatives, and to call the attention of the French government to the bearing the contest may have on the rights and interests of neutral nations. Refers to the proclamation of blockade by President Lincoln, and to that granting letters of marque by Jefferson Davis.	
	Lord Russell to Lord Lyons.	May 6	Opening of the civil war in the United States has caused her Majesty's government to determine that the parties are in a position to claim the rights and to perform the obligations attaching to belligerents. Without concealment of this view of the British government, their regret at the disastrous state of affairs in the United States cannot be too strongly expressed.	36
	Do.....	May 11	Reception at the residence of Lord Russell of Mr. Yancey, Mr. Mann, and Judge Rost, emissaries of the insurgents. They state that secession from the Union was based on the high prices of manufactured goods. They quote the wealth of the South, and propose to open their country to foreign commerce. Lord Russell states that he cannot officially communicate with them, but two propositions would arise with question of recognition; whether they could maintain their position as an independent state, and in what manner do they intend to maintain relations with foreign states.	37
1	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	May 17	Reception at Liverpool by American chamber of commerce. Supposed community of interest in favor of cotton culture influences public sentiment of Liverpool in favor of insurgents. Developments between the 1st and 14th of May in the House of Commons of the intention of the British government to elevate the insurgents to the level of belligerents. Cordial reception by Mr. Dallas. The death of the Duke of Bedford postpones presentation by Lord Russell and prevents conversation upon Queen's proclamation prior to its issue. Subsequent presentation by Lord Palmerston on Thursday. Public opinion in England and the unsatisfactory debate in the Lords on the Queen's proclamation demand an early interview with Lord Russell. Postponement of Mr. Gregory's motion in Commons to 7th of June.	38
		May 13	Queen's proclamation.....	41

DECLARATION OF PARIS.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
3	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	1861. April 24	Refers to proposition of President in 1854, to maritime powers, that free ships make free goods, and that neutral property on enemy's vessel not to be confiscated, and to the declaration of Paris. States reasons for rejection by United States, with abstract of subsequent proposition to England and France. Instruction to ascertain whether British government will now agree to project of convention inclosed, based upon declaration of Paris.	44
	Lord Russell to Earl Cowley.	May 6	Refers to civil war in United States and states determination of British government to consider the self-styled confederacy a belligerent. Instruction to call attention of French government to probable bearing of the contest on rights and interests of neutrals, and asks whether, in view of the situation and the proclamations issued in United States, the French and English governments should not invite the contestants to act upon principles in second and third articles of declaration of Paris. Refers to practice of the United States as at variance with declarations; alludes to negotiations in 1856; their subsequent interruption by President Buchanan; and commends co-operation of England and France to obtain adoption of principles above mentioned. Asks the views of French government	48
	Earl Cowley to Lord Russell.	May 9	States, in reference to interview with Mr. Thouvenel for submission of contents of instruction of May 6, that French government agree to the proposition. Mr. Thouvenel makes a suggestion concerning manner of obtaining assent of belligerents in United States. In view of agreement between United States and France on declaration of Paris, no difficulty may be anticipated. Precedents for recognition of belligerent rights of insurgents to be found in British treatment of letters of marque during revolution in America.	49
	Lord Russell to Earl Cowley.	May 13	Expression of satisfaction with the views of French government.	50
	Do.....	May 16	Inclosing copy of dispatch to Lord Lyons, relative to adoption of declaration of Paris by United States.	50
	Earl Cowley to Lord Russell.	May 17	States that dispatch to Lord Lyons has been laid before Mr. Thouvenel, who approves draught, and informs Earl Cowley that Mr. Mercier has already been similarly instructed.	50
	Lord Russell to Lord Lyons.	May 18	States that the French government concur in instructions which announce the determination of British government to admit belligerent rights of insurgents in United States, and also in others relating to adoption of declaration of Paris by belligerents, and have similarly instructed	51

DECLARATION OF PARIS—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
		1861.		
10	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	May 21	Mr. Mercier. States that British government cannot accept renunciation of privateering by United States, if coupled with condition that they should enforce its renunciation on insurgents. Requests Lord Lyons to transmit copy of previous dispatch of same date to the president of insurgents, by way of British consul at Charleston or New Orleans.	51
2	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	May 21	States that United States consider privateers in insurgent service pirates, and that United States will avail herself of law of nations if Great Britain gives them shelter from pursuit and punishment. British government can avoid this by accepting proposition in regard to declaration of Paris. A refusal to accede to it now will seem a desire by Great Britain to patronize privateering so long as it may be aimed at the destruction of the United States.	52
	Lord Russell to Lord Lyons.	May 21	States to Lord Russell that he has instructions to negotiate in regard to rights of neutrals in time of war, who replies, after a review of previous negotiations, that he had already transmitted authority to Lord Lyons to assent to the only point at issue.	52
5	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	May 22	States that Mr. Adams has informed him that United States were disposed to adhere to declaration of Paris, and that he had been empowered to negotiate upon the subject. That in view of the power of the French and English ministers at Washington to settle the question, Mr. Adams consented to leave it in the hands of Mr. Seward.	53
6do.....	May 27	Acknowledges receipt of President's proclamation of blockade of coast of Virginia and North Carolina, and instructions to negotiate for abolition of privateering. Suggests the propriety of procuring exemption of private property from capture, in addition to the terms of proposed convention, and expresses doubts as to the expedition of the negotiation.	53
8do.....	May 30	Inclosing copy of his note informing Mr. Thouvenel that he was empowered to negotiate in regard to privateering, rights of neutrals, and to the subject of the blockade.	54
			States that he has informed Mr. Thouvenel of his authority to negotiate to accept the four propositions adopted at congress of Paris in 1856, with the addition of the provision exempting private property afloat, if not contraband, from capture. States reasons for pressing the adoption of the addition upon the French government. Mr. Thouvenel states that if the proposition is submitted in writing, the other maritime powers would be addressed, and answers would probably be received in ten days. States substance of French laws in	

DECLARATION OF PARIS—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
		1861.		
	Lord Lyons to Lord Russell.	June 4	reference to the entrance of a French subject into the service of a foreign privateer. Acknowledges receipt of instructions to propose to United States adherence to principles respecting maritime law laid down in declaration of Paris. Confers with Mr. Mercier, who had received similar instructions, and was directed to instruct consul at New Orleans to make similar proposals to insurgent government. They agree that an identical course by Great Britain and France would best accomplish the object. The United States adhere to the declaration of Paris, in the expectation that the British and French governments will be bound by its acceptance to consider the southern privateers pirates. States that it would be difficult to prevent southern privateering now, and there is little hope that cabinet will approve or Congress ratify convention that does not bind contracting parties to consider southern privateers pirates.	5
9	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	June 7	Mr. Thouvenel's remark as to consultation with foreign powers applied only to conference with ministers of French government. The statement in American newspapers that the United States would adhere to declaration of Paris will prevent acceptance of amendment proposed. Reasons why the acceptance of the declaration by England and France will not be so beneficial to United States as anticipated.	56
10 do.....	June 12	Incloses copy of his written proposition in regard to declaration of Paris. States that European press take it for granted that accession of United States to declaration of Paris would not alter relations of maritime powers to the self-styled confederacy. Suggests that the recognition of belligerent rights of insurgents prevents its application, if adopted by United States, to insurgent privateers. Probable difficulty of procuring, now, adherence of other powers to the declaration.	57
	Lord Russell to Mr. Gray.	June 12	States that Mr. Thouvenel has invited opinion of British government to propositions of Mr. Dayton that private property on the sea in time of war should be free from capture and that as privateering being abolished the privateers of the insurgents should be deemed pirates, and gives reasons for disapproval of propositions by her Majesty's government.	58
8	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	June 14	On the 12th instant Lord Russell informs Mr. Adams of Mr. Dayton's propositions to French government, and that he had formerly stated his readiness to consent to the total omission of the 4th article of the declaration of Paris if agreeable to the U. S.	59
	Mr. Grey to Lord Russell.	June 14	States that Mr. Thouvenel's views concur with those of Lord Russell in regard to	60

DECLARATION OF PARIS—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
		1861.		
19	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.	June 17	adoption of Mr. Dayton's proposed modification of declaration of Paris, and that while the French government had declined Mr. Dayton's propositions, it would accept the declaration of Paris if not amended. After long delay and no reply to previous proposition on same subject, Lord Lyons and Mr. Mercier have made known the desire of their governments to receive acceptance of the United States to declaration of Paris. Mr. Seward declines to officially receive communications which assume that the insurgents are entitled to belligerent rights. States reasons therefor, and refers to duty and capacity of United States to fulfill all treaty obligations and to prevent the violation by insurgents of the rights of friendly nations.	60
	Lord Lyons to Lord Russell.	June 17	Informes Lord Russell that, with Mr. Mercier, he had received on the 15th, from Mr. Seward, the view entertained by the United States of the declaration of Paris. Mr. Seward declines to receive communication founded on assumption that insurgents are belligerents and that the question could be adjusted at Paris and London. Copies of the French and English instructions are left with Mr. Seward as data for dispatch. Mr. Seward informally objects to concert of action between Great Britain and France towards United States, and says that he could agree to all that was requested concerning declaration of Paris, but it was not his intention to take official cognizance of the belligerency ascribed to insurgents unless forced to do so.	62
	Do.....	June 17	Referring to conference between Mr. Mercier, Mr. Seward, and himself, in which Mr. Seward conceived the proposition under discussion to be entirely distinct from his proposal to adhere to declaration of Paris. Lord Lyons subsequently explained the difference and received from Mr. Seward complaints as to the absence of any attention on offer to of England and France to his the part adhere without reserve to same declaration. That he would prefer Mr. Marcy's amendment, but would accept declaration as it stood, and should instruct Mr. Adams to proceed with negotiation.	63
21	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	June 19	States that Lord Russell's instruction to Lord Lyons asks, on the 15th of June, the United States to concede to England principles of declaration of Paris, which, on the 24th of April, formed the substance of a proposition to England. As Lord Lyons does not seem authorized to negotiate at Washington, Mr. Adams is requested to open negotiations, if acceptable at London.	64
	Lord Russell to Lord Lyons.	June 21	Recapitulates Mr. Dayton's proposition to French government about declaration of	64

DECLARATION OF PARIS—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
		1861.		
29	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.	June 22	Paris, and the concurrence of Great Britain in the rejection of it by France. States that Mr. Adams has not been instructed to make similar proposition to Great Britain. States that United States insist that France shall do nothing to concede belligerent rights to the insurgents, and that they decline to hear her opinion of insurgent title to belligerency. When France acts in violation of her friendly obligations to United States then we will inquire whether, after accession to declaration of Paris, she could shelter pirates in her ports, and then we can decide the character of our remedy. States that United States will not consent to severance of friendly relations, and that the responsibility of the next step is with France.	65
12	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	June 22	Incloses copy of Mr. Thouvenel's reply to proposition to open negotiations for accession of France to declaration of Paris. Mr. Thouvenel states that the United States must address all the powers associated in the declaration before his proposal can be considered. Mr. Dayton is in doubt whether condition of the United States modified by action of Great Britain, France, and Spain, in regard to privateering and belligerent rights, will permit accession to declaration of Paris. Delay cannot jeopardize affairs. Awaits instructions to accept for United States declaration of Paris, pure and simple.	65
32	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	July 1	States that while the United States would prefer to add Mr. Marcy's amendment to the declaration of Paris, yet they are ready to accept declaration as it stands.	67
27	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.	July 6	States that the acceptance of the declaration of Paris has become complicated by reason of French acknowledgment of insurgent belligerency, and Mr. Dayton's departure from instruction No. 4. Reasons which demanded immediate presentation of proposition to French government. Impracticability of the Marcy amendment to exempt private property afloat from capture in time of war, and the not unreasonable motive which caused delay to negotiation by adding amendment to the declaration, pure and simple, as first tendered by Mr. Seward. States that it is not a time for propagandism, but for energetic action, to arrest the worst of all national calamities, and directs Mr. Dayton to renew proposition for an adoption of declaration of Paris in form originally prescribed, and to avoid compromising the exclusive sovereignty of United States. If any question concerning it shall arise, let it be introduced by France, and in that case Mr. Dayton must await instructions,	67

RECOGNITION OF REBEL BELLIGERENCY.

XI

DECLARATION OF PARIS—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
		1861.		
	Lord Lyons to Lord Russell.	July 8	but must assure the French government of the desire of the United States to lead in the negotiations when there shall be hope for the adoption of the Marcy amendment. States that he has given Mr. Seward a list of the powers which have acceded to declaration of Paris on maritime law. In reference to the complication at Paris, produced by Mr. Dayton, Mr. Seward says if the United States declared that their accession to Paris declaration would impose an obligation on France with regard to disloyal as well as loyal States of the Union, or if the French government announced that by the acceptance of the accession of the United States they did not intend to contract any engagement affecting the insurgent States, Mr. Dayton's apprehension that an acceptance of the declaration would be injurious to United States, might be well founded. If the point described could be omitted from discussion, the accession of the United States might be accepted now, and its effect on insurgents determined afterward. Delay would arise from consultation with other powers. Mr. Seward presumed that practically England and France were sure that United States held that the flag covered the cargo, and that the goods of friends were free under enemy's flag; that it would endeavor to protect commerce of friends, and would hang privateers' crews as pirates. Lord Lyons informs Mr. Seward that last measure could not be acceptable to England or France, and informs Lord Russell that it is important that the accession of United States to declaration should not be accepted without informing them of the effect of acceptance by England and France with regard to insurgents.	70
14	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	July 12	Acknowledges receipt of dispatches from 2 to 25. Recapitulates series of misunderstandings in regard to accession to declaration of Paris. States purpose to obtain from Lord Russell distinct answer in writing of disposition to open negotiations in London.	71
17do.	July 19	Refers to Mr. Seward's No. 32, and incloses copy of correspondence with Lord Russell relative to opening negotiation at London. Describes misunderstanding concerning conversation at the first interview between Lord Russell and himself relative to declaration of Paris. Has left copy of convention with Lord Russell for submission to British cabinet, and states that Constitution of United States requires agreement to be submitted for action of	72

DECLARATION OF PARIS—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
		1861.		
20	Mr. Adams to Lord Russell.	July 19	Senate. Incloses note from Lord Russell, stating that as soon as British government is informed that similar convention has been concluded at Paris, it will accede. Informs Lord Russell that he will ascertain extent of Mr. Dayton's powers to negotiate with France. If he is not authorized to proceed, further instructions from Washington will be required.	75
	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	July 26	Refers to his dispatch No. 17, and states that he has received from Mr. Dayton an account of his proposition to French government to accept Marcy amendment. Approves the propriety of Mr. Dayton's course, and speculates on the position of Great Britain. States that Mr. Dayton agrees to proceed on basis proposed by Lord Russell so soon as it shall be conveyed to him in writing.	76
49	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	July 29	Approves proposed appeal to British government on the subject of the declaration of Paris.	78
22	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	July 30	Incloses copy of note wherein Mr. Adams requests him to ascertain from French government whether it will agree simultaneously with that of Great Britain to accept accession of United States to declaration of Paris, pure and simple, also copy of his reply signifying readiness to ascertain.	78
22	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Aug. 2	Incloses copy of a note to Lord Russell of July 29, relating to situation of Mr. Dayton's proposal to French government, and his intention to propose the accession of France to declaration of Paris, pure and simple, simultaneously with the assent of Great Britain, and a copy of Lord Russell's reply, wherein he agrees to negotiate as soon as conventions can be simultaneously signed in Paris and London, but adds that Great Britain considers the engagement prospective and not retroactive.	80
24	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	Aug. 2	States that instruction No. 27 has been anticipated by action based on information from Mr. Adams, and incloses copy of note to Mr. Thouvenel proposing to enter into a convention with France for accession to declaration of Paris, pure and simple, and referring to similar proposition made to British government by Mr. Adams.	83
55	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Aug. 6	Awaits with solicitude issue of proposition referred to in Mr. Adams's No. 17. Similar propositions go forward to every maritime power in Europe.	84
	Earl Cowley to Earl Russell.	Aug. 8	States that Mr. Dayton has proposed to negotiate convention with France embodying four points of declaration of Paris.	85
58	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Aug. 12	Hopes that conference between Mr. Adams and Mr. Dayton will bring about understanding with England and France in regard to declaration of Paris.	85

RECOGNITION OF REBEL BELLIGERENCY.

XIII

DECLARATION OF PARIS—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
61	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	1861. Aug. 17	Approves proceedings referred to in Mr. Adams's No. 22, and after reviewing Lord Russell's remark that the acceptance by Great Britain of the accession of United States to declaration of Paris will be prospective, not retroactive, instructs Mr. Adams to ask Lord Russell for an explanation of this modification before any further proceedings in the proposed negotiation.	85
	Earl Russell to Earl Cowley.	Aug. 19	Incloses copy of his note to Mr. Adams respecting signature to proposed convention, and a copy of declaration he proposes to issue on signing the convention.	88
	Earl Cowley to Earl Russell.	Aug. 20	States that Mr. Thouvenel, upon receiving Lord Russell's note and declaration, informed him that France had determined to issue similar declaration, but that Mr. Dayton thought he could not receive such declaration without referring to his government; that Mr. Dayton hardly concealed from Mr. Thouvenel that the object of United States in signing convention was to force western powers to treat southern privateers as pirates.	88
35	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	Aug. 22	States that both England and France refuse to negotiate except on understanding that convention is not to bear directly or indirectly on domestic difficulty in United States. Incloses a copy of Mr. Thouvenel's note, a copy of proposed convention, and of the French declaration. States that Mr. Thouvenel distinctly informed him that neither England nor France could deal with southern privateers as pirates, and that they could dispense with admission of United States to declaration of Paris before participating in their domestic controversy, and that the declaration to accompany proposed convention announces this determination. Mr. Dayton replied that his instructions contained no authority to vary obligations which France might incur by interpretation of terms of convention, and that United States could not recognize any distinction between its loyal and rebel citizens in treating with foreign governments. Mr. Thouvenel states that the outside declaration proposes to prevent future controversy concerning strict neutrality France had adopted. Mr. Dayton suggests to Mr. Adams either to issue counter declaration declining to admit doctrine of Anglo-French declaration, and proposes to await Mr. Adams reply before further conference with Mr. Thouvenel.	88
32	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Aug. 23	Incloses copy of note from Lord Russell with copy of declaration to be issued on signing the proposed convention, and has become acquainted with the intention of the French government to issue similar	91

DECLARATION OF PARIS—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
		1861.		
	Earl Cowley to Earl Russell.	Aug. 27	document. States that Mr. Dayton and himself await further instructions.	92
37	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	Aug. 29	States that he has informed Mr. Thouvenel that Mr. Adams refuses to sign convention without further instructions. Incloses copy of his note of August 26 to Mr. Thouvenel reviewing the intention of French government to declare that convention does not implicate it directly or indirectly in the internal conflict in United States. Has adopted Mr. Adams's suggestion to stop negotiations, and explaining position and anticipations of United States to await further instructions.	93
34	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Aug. 30	Announces failure of negotiation, and incloses note of August 23d informing Lord Russell of determination to decline, in view of the proposed outside declaration, to sign the contemplated convention on the day appointed. After reviewing progress of negotiations, he infers influence in the cabinet adverse to success of proposition of United States.	95
	Earl Russell to Earl Cowley.	Aug. 31	Incloses Mr. Adams's note in regard to British declaration upon conclusion of convention, and his reply thereto.	99
83	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Sept. 7	Reviews proceeding of Lord Russell as evinced in his proposed declaration to accompany convention, approves Mr. Adams's interruption of negotiations, and instructs him to inform Lord Russell that the proposed declaration is inadmissible, because it is impossible to permit a foreign power to adjust its relations upon assumed internal differences in United States, because it is not mutual, and because it is a departure from the declaration of Paris. If British government shall adhere to proposition, negotiation must be suspended. Anticipation of future relinquishment of present objections by Great Britain to position of United States. Regarding negotiation terminated, Mr. Seward states the views of the United States in regard to rights of neutrals in present case, and incloses copy of act of Congress which prohibited, in 1838, intervention with British authority in Canada.	100
39	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Sept. 7	Acknowledges receipt of dispatches from 61 to 67, and transmits copies of Lord Russell's note to him of the 28th of August, and of his instruction to Lord Lyons in reference to declaration of Paris, proposed modification by outside declaration and declination of Mr. Adams to conclude negotiation. View of certain involutions of British policy, and the probable suggestion of the outside modification of declaration of Paris by some member of the cabinet in the interest of the insurgents. Notes date of indorsement upon Lord Russell's note.	103

DECLARATION OF PARIS—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
44	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	1861. Sept. 7	Incloses copy of a letter of August 5 to Mr. Adams in regard to unacceptability to England of Marcy amendment, and to interpretation of Lord Russell's statement that the engagements of Great Britain will be prospective. Refers to proposed outside declaration, and to explanation requested.	110
56	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.	Sept. 10	Reviews progress of negotiation with France, and expresses the opinion entertained by the United States of the proposed modification of the declaration of Paris. Instructs Mr. Dayton to inform Mr. Thouvenel that the proposed outside declaration is deemed inadmissible by the President, and if it shall be insisted upon, negotiations must be suspended.	111
45	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	Sept. 10	Incloses translation of a note of the 9th instant from Mr. Thouvenel, relating to specific grounds of exception to an unconditional acceptance of declaration of Paris.	114
	Lord Lyons to Earl Russell.	Sept. 10	Has heard Mr. Seward read instruction to Mr. Adams to break off negotiation.	116
	Earl Cowley to Earl Russell.	Sept. 10	States that Mr. Dayton has informed Mr. Thouvenel of suspension of negotiations.	117
68	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Sept. 14	Acknowledges No. 34, and refers to 83 as anticipating the course pursued. States that Lord Lyons has read to him letter to Mr. Edwards upon Dominican affairs.	117
	Earl Cowley to Earl Russell.	Sept. 24	Has informed Mr. Thouvenel that if the proposed declaration is insisted on, the United States intend to break off negotiations.	117
52	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Sept. 28	Acknowledges receipt of Mr. Seward's 83, and states that he will await further approval of his proceedings before communicating with Lord Russell.	118
59	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	Oct. 14	Has submitted copy of Mr. Seward's 56, in reference to accession of United States to Paris declaration, to Mr. Thouvenel.	118
104	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Oct. 19	Communicates President's approval of Mr. Adams's proceedings; states that the present development of insurrection is due to toleration of its appeals in Europe.	119
	Lord Lyons to Earl Russell.	Dec. 6	Transmitting copies diplomatic correspondence for 1861. States that a review of the correspondence supports the determination of England and France not to accept accession of United States to declaration of Paris without the obligations assumed towards the acceded States.	119
	Earl Russell to Lord Lyons.	Dec. 20	Instructs Lord Lyons to inform Mr. Seward that in case of war between England and United States, the former will relinquish her right to privateering, provided the United States would reciprocate.	120
	Do.....	Dec. 24	Referring to approval by United States of Mr. Adams's refusal to sign convention as modified by declaration.	121
133	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	1862. Mar. 20	Sentiment in Parliament concerning rights on ocean, and of blockade during the war. Difficulties attending the adoption of in-	121

REVOCATION OF MR. BUNCH'S EXEQUATUR, ETC.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
		1862.	terest as a rule of action. Indifferent disposition of England to respect neutral rights and blockade in present war, and reasons therefor.	

REVOCATION OF MR. BUNCH'S EXEQUATUR, OR MR. BUNCH'S MISSION.

	Lord Lyons to Lord Russell.	1861. July 8	Transmits copy of instruction to Mr. Bunch relative to obtaining a satisfactory declaration from southern government as to maritime rights of neutrals. Mr. Mercier has sent similar instructions to the French acting consul at Charleston.	123
	Lord Russell to Lord Lyons.	July 24	Approves Lord Lyons's instructions to Mr. Bunch.	124
	Lord Lyons to Lord Russell.	Aug. 2	Reports Mr. Bunch's receipt of instructions.	124
	Consul Bunch to Mr. Hammond.	Aug. 5	Incloses number of letters in accompanying bag, which are intended for post.	124
	Lord Lyons to Earl Russell.	Aug. 16	Incloses correspondence with Vice-Consul Edwards relative to arrest at New York of Mr. Robert Mure, naturalized citizen of United States, on charge of carrying dispatches from rebel government to its commissioners in Europe. Refers to Mr. Mure's character as dispatch bearer. Mr. Seward states that Mure's passport is invalid, and that private letters from insurgents were found in his possession. Lord Lyons states that British vice-consul at New York has been instructed to ascertain truth of charges against Mure.	125
	Do.....	Aug. 16	Refers to paragraph in Baltimore Sun, which states that confederate congress has accepted the second, third, and fourth clauses of declaration of Paris.	127
63	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Aug. 17	Incloses Mure's passport, Consul Bunch's letter, and details particulars of arrest, and describes papers and bag found in Mure's possession. Sends Mr. Schultz with bag and instructs Mr. Adams to request the return of the contents, if treasonable, and in such case to inform Lord Russell of the expectation of the United States that Mr. Bunch will be visited with the displeasure of the British government. Lord Lyons is aware of transaction and general character of dispatch.	127
64do.....	Aug. 17	States that Mr. Bunch is implicated as conspirator against United States by letter found in Mure's possession, and requests Mr. Bunch's recall.	131
	Lord Lyons to Earl Russell.	Aug. 19	Refers to disposition of bag taken from Mure by Mr. Seward, and reviews suspicions of Mr. Seward concerning its treasonable contents. States that instruction of Mr. Bunch to Mr. Mure do not seem extraordinary, and that Mr. Seward is sincere and courteous.	131

REVOCATION OF MR. BUNCH'S EXEQUATUR, ETC.—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
	Lord Lyons to Earl Russell.	1861. Aug. 23	Incloses extracts from newspapers relating to conversation described in letter taken from Mure between its writer and Mr. Bunch relative to the mission of Messrs. Belligny and Trescott to Richmond, and suggests that there has been an abuse of Bunch's confidence by Mure.	132
	Do.....	Aug. 30	Inclosing a dispatch from Consul Bunch relative to proceedings to procure adherence of so-called Confederate States to declaration of Paris; a copy of resolutions of congress at Richmond on the subject; a copy of instructions issued by the president of insurgents to private armed vessels, and a copy of form of bond required.	134
	Do.....	Sept. 2	Expresses satisfaction with proceedings of Consul Bunch.	139
	Earl Russell to Earl Cowley.	Sept. 7	Transmits copies of Mr. Adams's letter requesting recall of Mr. Bunch. States that the first proposal for instruction, the execution of which proved offensive to United States, came from France. States that British government decline to accede to request, without, however, admitting that the negotiation with the southern government is a step to the recognition of the confederacy.	139
	Earl Cowley to Lord Russell.	May 9	States that Mr. Thouvenel agrees that the assent of the belligerents in United States should be procured if possible to the second and third articles of the declaration of Paris; that consuls should be made organs of communication with southern States; that as France and United States had always agreed on articles proposed, it would be difficult for either party in America to refuse assent; that at beginning of American Revolution Great Britain treated letters of marque as piracy, though she subsequently acknowledged the belligerent rights of the States.	140
41	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Sept. 9	States that he has delivered bag captured from Mure into hands of Mr. Layard, of British Foreign Office, and has communicated to Lord Russell circumstances attending capture. States that he has requested that Mr. Bunch may be recalled, and incloses two notes to Lord Russell upon the subject. Announces return of Captain Schultz with dispatches from Mr. Dayton.	141
	Earl Cowley to Earl Russell.	Sept. 10	States that, in reply to his note communicating the request of the United States for the recall of Mr. Bunch in consequence of his execution of orders, Mr. Thouvenel informed him that no similar request had been made of the French government, but that it would not give up an agent who had merely executed its orders.	144
	Earl Russell to Lord Lyons.	Sept. 14	Incloses copies of correspondence with Mr. Adams in relation to the proceedings of Mr. Bunch, and requests that an explana-	145

REVOCATION OF MR. BUNCH'S EXEQUATUR, ETC.—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom	Date.	Subject.	Page.
		1861.	tion may be made by Mr. Bunch of that part of his conduct which has received criticism by United States.	
44	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Sept. 14	Incloses two notes from Lord Russell in regard to the capture of British dispatch bag and the conduct of Consul Bunch. States that it appears that Bunch has been executing recent instructions. Lord Russell states that in view of interruption of mails in contravention of postal treaty with great Britain, private letters were confided to consular bag, and that on opening bag nothing was found of treasonable character; that Mr. Bunch cannot be recalled, and that the British government in endeavoring to obtain accession of southern States to last three articles of declaration of Paris, do not consider itself as taking the first step to a recognition of the southern confederacy.	146
	Earl Cowley to Earl Russell.	Sept. 17	States that Mr. Dayton has made no representation to French government in regard to participation of French consul at Charleston in Mr. Bunch's mission.	148
	Lord Lyons to Earl Russell.	Sept. 27	States that Mr. Bunch deüics statement contained in letter taken from Mure. Reports proceedings for facilitating correspondence with Bunch.	149
	Do.....	Oct. 8	Incloses dispatch from Consul Bunch explanatory of his conduct in regard to transmission of dispatches by Robert Mure.	149
108	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Oct. 22	Acknowledges receipt of No. 44, containing Lord Russell's statement concerning contents of intercepted dispatch bag. Objects to substitution of British dispatch bag for United States mail bag, and hopes that magnanimity of British government may be relied on not to complain of breach of international postal treaty, and of resort of United States to suppression of correspondence between insurgents and foreign nations.	151
109do.....	Oct. 23	Reviews Lord Russell's statement of Mr. Bunch's negotiation with insurgent government, and announces the reasons which induce United States to revoke Mr. Bunch's exequatur. States influence of Queen's proclamation on British relations with insurgent authorities, and expresses satisfaction with conduct of Lord Lyons, with whom an arrangement has been made for conveyance of correspondence of British government to and from its consuls residing in blockaded ports.	152
	Earl Russell to Lord Lyons.	Oct. 26	States that explanation communicated by Consul Bunch in his communication of the 30th September is not satisfactory, and requests further explanation from Mr. Bunch.	155
	Lord Lyons to Earl Russell.	Oct. 28	States that during an interview Mr. Seward read to him an instruction to Mr. Adams to inform the British government that the United States had determined to revoke	155

REVOCATION OF MR. BUNCH'S EXEQUATUR, ETC.—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
		1861.		
71	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Nov. 14	the exequatur of Mr. Bunch. States that in the dispatch no allusion is made to the co-operation in the negotiation of the French consul at Charleston. In reference to Mr. Bunch, Lord Lyons avers that never were serious charges brought upon a slighter foundation. Refers to dispatch No. 108, and states that during an interview on the 13th of November, he communicated its contents to Lord Russell, and incloses copy of his note to the British minister embodying substance of 108. Mr. Adams inquires concerning foundation of information of the revocation of Mr. Bunch's exequatur, which has reached England.	157
	Lord Lyons to Earl Russell.	Nov. 14	Communicates dispatch from Consul Bunch containing further explanation of the contents of the intercepted letters, and the reason for confiding his dispatches to Mr. Mure's care.	159
	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Nov. 15	States that Lord Palmerston in an interview refers to the revocation of Mr. Bunch's exequatur as a proceeding calculated to produce irritation. Mr. Adams has received no intimation of the fact from his government, and states that United States was desirous to raise no needless questions; but they were annoyed by proceedings of parties in sympathy with the rebellion in England and France. The sense of faith in foreign aid had kept up the rebellion, and was the only source of bad feeling in America for England.	161
74do	Nov. 22	States that in accordance with instruction 109 he has communicated to Earl Russell the determination of the United States to revoke the exequatur of Mr. Bunch.	162
75do	Nov. 22	Incloses Earl Russell's note of the 15th instant, in regard to the intercepted dispatch bag of Mr. Bunch and to transfer of discussions to Washington.	165
81do	Nov. 29	Incloses copy of Earl Russell's note in regard to revocation by United States of Mr. Bunch's exequatur and copy of Mr. Adams's reply thereto, in which the principles and reasons involved are discussed, especially the determination of the British government to communicate directly with insurgent government when necessity shall require.	165
136	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Nov. 30	States that at the time of the communication of the French and British governments to the insurgents, through Mr. Bunch, he had learned that England was prepared to assume a tone that should repel prevailing presumption of its inclination to a recognition. Offensive correspondence of Great Britain left no alternative but to revoke exequatur of offending consul, which was done because he had rendered himself personally obnoxious.	171

REVOCATION OF MR. BUNCH'S EXEQUATUR, ETC.—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
84	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	1861. Dec. 6	Incloses copies of further correspondence with Earl Russell in regard to revocation of Mr. Bunch's exequatur, wherein Earl Russell disclaims any interference in the domestic affairs of the United States; but explicitly claims the right of protecting the lives and property of British subjects wherever they may be threatened, attacked, or injured. Mr. Adams in reply states that he does not perceive that Earl Russell's interpretation of law of United States relieves Mr. Bunch, a consular officer under recognition of United States, undertaking diplomatic negotiation with persons in open resistance to its authority.	171
	Lord Lyons to Earl Russell.	Dec. 6	Calls attention to dispatch in published diplomatic correspondence for 1861, addressed to Mr. Adams, in regard to revocation of Mr. Bunch's exequatur; but has not received or seen any official notification of such revocation.	175
87	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Dec. 12	Incloses copy of a note from Earl Russell acknowledging that Mr. Bunch, under instructions from British government, placed himself in communication with persons in arms against United States.	175
	Lord Lyons to Earl Russell.	Dec. 23	States that with the exception of the information in Mr. Adams's note of the 21st of November, he has no official knowledge of revocation of Mr. Bunch's exequatur.	176
	Do	Dec.	States that Mr. Seward has informed him that Mr. Bunch's exequatur had been revoked some time, and that by a note of the 6th instant he finds that Mr. Adams had announced it to the British government. Refers to a communication of the fact to Mr. Bunch, and its effect upon his sources of information.	176
	Earl Russell to Lord Lyons.	1862. Jan. 18	States that the British government do not dispute right of United States to revoke Consul Bunch's exequatur, and that the vice-consul can sign such papers as are required for use in the United States.	177
	Mr. Mason to Earl Russell.	July 7	States that the adhesion of the Confederate States is given to the law of blockade as declared by the convention of Paris, with the addition engrafted by the British government relative to its maintenance by a force sufficient to prevent access to the coast of the enemy.	177
	Do	1863. Jan. —	Refers to previous note of July 7, 1862, communicating assent of Confederate States to principle of Paris declaration in regard to blockade, and states that the British government having derogated from the proposition agreed to, refuse either to reply to the official complaint of the confederacy or to make explanations requested.	178

RECOGNITION OF REBEL BELLIGERENCY.

XXI

DEMAND FOR REVOCATION OF REBEL BELLIGERENCY.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page
10	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	1861. May 21	States that course of events in Europe has made it necessary for the United States to take decided stand and signify its views. Reviews Mr. Dallas's proceedings, and informs Mr. Adams that whenever unofficial or official intercourse with insurgent emissaries is established he must arrest communication with British government. Mr. Adams is instructed to take no notice of any alliance between England and France in regard to United States. The blockade will be maintained, and it is expected that it will be respected. Every foreign consular or diplomatic agent in United States who shall disobey federal laws or disown federal authority, will be dismissed. The United States will question proceedings which have in view recognition of insurgents, and will treat insurgent privateers as pirates.	179
2	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	May 21	Interview with Lord Russell at Pembroke Lodge. Refers to effect of opinion in English private and public circles upon the difficulties in the United States and upon international relations. Lord Russell says that he informed Mr. Dallas that the British government were not disposed to interfere in struggle in United States, and he now adds that the course of the government in regard to participation of British subjects had necessarily to be defined. In regard to Hungary, cited by Lord Russell as a precedent for action of Great Britain in acknowledging belligerency of self-styled confederacy, Mr. Adams replies that the mission to Hungary was one only of inquiry, and was not followed by recognition. Mr. Adams refers to rights and duties of neutrals and his power to negotiate. Lord Russell informs him that Lord Lyons has authority to negotiate at Washington. Inquires concerning the kind of blockade established, and to the high tariff adopted by the United States. Lord Russell promises to communicate to United States through Lord Lyons a statement of the attitude of England in regard to rebellion.	182
	Lord Russell to Lord Lyons.	May 21	Relating the substance of conversation with Mr. Adams at Pembroke Lodge, May 18.	187
5	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	May 22	Mr. Thouvenel expresses concern of Emperor at disturbances in United States; desires to be informed concerning policy of United States in regard to neutrals, to southern privateers, and to blockade. Tender by the Emperor of his good offices to United States as mediator. Mr. Thouvenel's remarks to Mr. Dayton and Mr. Sanford in regard to neutral duties and rights of France.	189

DEMAND FOR REVOCATION OF REBEL BELLIGERENCY—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
10	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.	1861. May 30	Refers to Mr. Sanford's conversation with Mr. Thouvenel, and says that Mr. Thouvenel may be informed that any communication held by the French government with agents of insurgents will be considered by United States as exceptionable and injurious, and that the United States are not reconciled with recognition of the southern States as a belligerent power.	191
8	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	May 30	No disposition manifested in France to favor recognition of insurgent independence. The recognition according belligerent rights to insurgents is for commercial purposes.	192
14	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	June 3	Apprehension in United States of foreign aid or intervention in rebellion is justified by reserve of British ministry when protest of United States against recognition of insurgents was presented; by contracting an engagement with France without consulting United States as to policy in regard to rebellion; by Lord Russell's announcement that he was not unwilling to receive insurgent commissioners unofficially; by precipitate issue of Queen's proclamation. Has delayed communicating views of President until receipt of promised statement of England and France of their attitude towards United States. Expresses satisfaction of President with Mr. Adams's reception by British government.	193
15do	June 8	Reviews conversation between Lord Russell and Mr. Adams of 18th May in regard to foreign intervention. Approves Mr. Adams's interrogatories and statements. Refers to reasons given in dispatch 14 for anticipating foreign intervention. Refers to Queen's proclamation, and says that any of the positions of Lord Russell in regard to that instrument are not conceded by United States. Negotiations in regard to declaration of Paris can be conducted at Washington. Approves Mr. Adams's remarks on tariff.	194
16do	June 8	Incloses note to Lord Lyons in regard to application of rule exempting friends' goods in enemy's vessel to case of bark Winifred.	197
8	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	June 14	Converses with Lord Russell in regard to precipitate issue of Queen's proclamation, and to unofficial reception of insurgent emissaries. Receives assurance that British government intends to be entirely neutral, and that reception of commissioners did not imply recognition. Mr. Adams says that Queen's proclamation has relieved United States from liability for damages to British shipping by insurgents.	198
19	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.	June 17	Proceedings of United States in view of anxiety lest insurgents should obtain aid	200

RECOGNITION OF REBEL BELLIGERENCY.

XXIII

DEMAND FOR REVOCATION OF REBEL BELLIGERENCY—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
		1861.	from foreign nations. Views of United States government in regard to declaration of Paris communicated in proposition to England and France. That he could not receive the dispatches which Lord Lyons and Mr. Mercier were directed to communicate. Refers to the understanding between England and France as to one course in reference to rebellion in United States. Communication in Mr. Mercier's dispatch of the recognition of the insurgents as belligerents by France; also of the inclination of France to negotiate in relation to neutral rights. Bearing of the present state of affairs upon the future relations between the two countries.	
21	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	June 19	Refers to interview with Lord Lyons and Mr. Mercier, wherein Lord Lyons presents a dispatch from his government, which United States cannot receive, stating that the country is considered by England to be divided into two belligerent parties; implying, without specification, the possession of belligerent rights by the insurgents. President declines, with appreciation, the mediation tendered by Great Britain.	205
11	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	June —	Mr. Thouvenel has informed him that the French government has no idea of recognizing the independence of the insurgent government, and that he has received Mr. Rost as a private citizen. All efforts of the confederate agents have been unsuccessful in obtaining either recognition or money from France.	208
	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	June 21	Is not able to recall occasion when his language seemed offensive to Lord Lyons. He has refrained from expressing to Lord Lyons dissatisfaction which has been produced by his communications. Obstruction to diplomatic intercourse greater than the manner of conducting it is to be found in the opinion of the American people, based upon indifference of British government and community to integrity of United States.	209
	Lord Russell to Lord Lyons.	June 21	Satisfaction with Mr. Adams's conduct. Only complaint Mr. Adams has made has been against premature publication of Queen's proclamation of neutrality. Reviews the reasons which induced British government to recognize belligerency of insurgents. Cites Mr. Canning. The governments of France and England agree that proposition of Mr. Dayton to attach Marcy amendment to declaration of Paris ought to be rejected.	210
22	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.	June 22	Shall regard France as respecting United States until she practically violates her friendly obligation.	211
10	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	June 28	Communication to Lord Russell of President's views, expressed in Mr. Seward's 14 and 15.	212

DEMAND FOR REVOCATION OF REBEL BELLIGERENCY—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
33	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	1861. July 1	Can never acquiesce in assumption of Great Britain that United States is divided in two parts; though, if Great Britain forbears from interference, United States will not inquire concerning the names it gives that forbearance.	212
27	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.	July 6	Causes of misapprehension of instructions concerning proposition to France to accept declaration of Paris. United States will not acquiesce in declaration of France, which assumes that United States is not exclusive sovereign in States and Territories of the Union; and they adhere to declaration of Paris, pure and simple, as an undivided nation.	213
42	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	July 21	Profound solicitude of President to avert foreign war. Reasons for protesting against foreign recognition and interference in insurrection. Reasons for refraining from proving to Great Britain the assumed error of her recognition of insurgents as belligerents, and for desiring mutual forbearance until reconciliation of conflicting systems shall have become impossible. Mutual forbearance authorized President to inform Congress on 4th of July that sovereignty of United States was respected by all nations. Substantial character of the policy of the United States, and disastrous consequences if the war involves foreign states.	214
21	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	July 22	Will communicate reasons of United States for not officially receiving a communication from Mr. Mercier, announcing concession of belligerent rights to insurgents. Comments upon the intention of France to address the government at Montgomery.	216
35do	Aug. 22	Informa Mr. Thouvenel that any declaration which recognized distinction between North and South was a matter upon which the United States were peculiarly sensitive; that they treated with foreign governments for the whole country. Mr. Thouvenel answered that France did not contest the right of United States to treat for the whole country; that the declaration was intended to prevent misconception in the future.	217
	Earl Russell to Messrs. Yancy, Root, and Mann.	Aug. 24	Acknowledges receipt of their letter of the 14th, and informs them that the British government cannot acknowledge the independence of the so-styled confederacy.	218
34	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Aug. 30	Incloses Lord Russell's letter to Mr. Edwards, of 14th May, in regard to annexation of Dominican territory to Spain, and invites attention to designation of contending parties in America.	218
	Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.	Sept. 9	The British government have recognized belligerent character of southern States but are not prepared to recognize independence of so-called confederacy.	220

DEMAND FOR REVOCATION OF REBEL BELLIGERENCY—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
61	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	1861. Oct. 18	Movements inspired by insurgent emissaries to influence British government; character of public speeches of British ministers; public review of American affairs by Earl Russell. Intentions of British government expressed in leading article in London Post, Lord Palmerston's paper. Lord Russell's probable friendship for United States.	220
	Lord Lyons to Earl Russell.	Nov. 4	Mr. Seward says reception of confederate vessels in British ports is the only difficulty between United States and Great Britain. Lord Lyons informs Mr. Seward that objection to communication between England, France, and the <i>de facto</i> government of the South, can only keep open a source of irritation; there was necessity for such communication. Cites instances, and Mr. Seward's reply.	221
	Earl Russell to Messrs. Yancey, Rost, and Mann.	Dec. 7	Declines to enter into official communication.	222
168	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	1862. Jan. 23	Embarrassment of United States by the position of the British government in regard to entertainment of insurgent cruisers in British ports. Effective military capacity of United States.	223
170do.....	Feb. 5	Approves proceeding of Mr. Adams in regard to "Nashville." Has communicated to Mr. Perry uselessness to European maritime powers of a policy which invites insurgent privateers and repels American commerce from their ports. United States have heard with incredulity that France proposed three months ago, to Great Britain, recognition and intervention to break blockade. Has received evidence that secession sympathizers will inaugurate debate and motion in Parliament for recognition.	223
182do.....	Feb. 13	If British government still perseveres in its policy, is it asking too much of them to lend protection of their courts to the enforcement of the neutrality commanded by the Queen's proclamation?	224
114	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.	Feb. 19	Reviews Mr. Dayton's report of conversation with Mr. Thouvenel in reference to neutral rights and duties as affected by war in United States, and to progress and end of military operations.	224
196	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Feb. 27	Concession of belligerent rights to insurgents is cause of all embarrassments between England and United States. Presumes propriety of revoking that concession upon attention of British government.	226
197do.....	Feb. 28	Successes in the West permit partial restoration of inland trade and adoption of measures in relation to sea coast, which will be some alleviation to blockade.	227
199do.....	Mar. 6	Duration of the war in the United States is dependent upon revocation of the Brit-	227

DEMAND FOR REVOCATION OF REBEL BELLIGERENCY—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
		1862.		
123	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.	Mar. 8	ish concession of belligerent rights to insurgents. Requests that Earl Russell may be asked whether it would not be wiser and better to remove necessity of blockade than to keep the world in debate about expediency of trying to break it.	228
203	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Mar. 10	Proof of the efficiency of the blockade. The insurrection is kept alive by the treatment of the insurgents as lawful belligerents by the maritime powers.	229
209do.....	Mar. 15	Statements to prove efficiency of blockade. Losses and sufferings in Europe by reason of war in United States may be removed by rescinding the decrees of England and France which concede belligerent rights to a faction.	229
210do.....	Mar. 17	Is gratified with improved condition of public opinion in Great Britain. As insurrection is approaching exhaustion, the President hopes that Mr. Adams is sparing no efforts to convince Earl Russell that the time has come when the concession of belligerent rights may be revoked with safety to Great Britain.	230
129	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	Mar. 25	Occupation of southern ports by Union forces will probably terminate illicit trade with Great Britain. Does not understand why maritime powers do not rescind belligerent rights accorded to insurgents.	230
133	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.	Mar. 26	Conversation with Emperor about cotton supply, opening the ports, and the concession of belligerent rights to insurgents.	231
135	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Mar. 27	Refers to conversation of Mr. Dayton with the Emperor, to the distress among French cotton operatives produced by civil war in the United States, and to the policy of France based on aspect of affairs in Europe at the beginning of the war. Instructs Mr. Dayton to communicate to Mr. Thouvenel the purpose of the President to remove the extraordinary restraints which have been imposed upon commerce as soon as practicable, and that the pacification of the Union would be assisted by the revocation of belligerent rights accorded to insurgents and reasons therefor.	233
131	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	Mar. 31	Doubts the expediency of pressing upon the British government arguments for retraction of their error in granting to rebels belligerent rights.	234
			Conversation with Mr. Thouvenel in regard to the propriety of France retracting the concession of belligerent rights to insurgents. Mr. Thouvenel says that France cannot act without conference with England. He thinks that the concession is of little importance if the United States is in possession of all the ports. The sympathies of France have been from the beginning with the North.	

DEMAND FOR REVOCATION OF REBEL BELLIGERENCY—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
217	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	1862. Mar. 31	Incloses dispatch of Mr. Dayton reporting conversation with the Emperor of the French.	235
218do	April 1	Reasons for continuing to urge upon the British government the revocation of the concession of belligerent rights to the insurgents. Geographical and social reasons that render such a peaceful separation as intimated by Lord Russell impossible.	235
140	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	April 3	Still adheres to the opinion that no good would come from pressing upon British government, now, the propriety of revoking the concession of belligerency to the insurgents.	236
228	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	April 14	If the expectations of the insurgents of recognition of their sovereignty by principal maritime powers were removed, the President feels assured that the opening of the ports might be conceded at once. Leaves to the discretion of Mr. Adams the selection of the occasion for communicating this view to the British government.	236
138	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.	April 15	Surveys military position which authorizes Mr. Thotvehel to assume that insurrection is failure. That commercial interests of France are involved in revocation of belligerency accorded to insurgents, and the supply of cotton depends upon duration of the insurrection. That blockade can be raised as soon as concession of belligerency to insurgents is revoked.	237
144	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	April 16	Presses upon Lord Russell the revocation by England of the concession of belligerent rights, as it is now the only remaining moral support of the insurgents. Refers to absence of aversion on the part of the French Emperor to entertain the question. Lord Russell justifies English neutrality, and denies disposition of British government to protect blockade runners. Mr. Adams cites cases where, if United States should adopt similar neutrality, Great Britain could not fail to be injured. The treatment of the Orto is a source of unfriendly feeling between the two nations. Lord Russell does not know how England can alter her policy.	238
137	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	April 17	Will keep in view the suggestion in regard to withdrawal by France of concession of belligerent rights. Will confer with Mr. Adams before communicating with French government in writing.	241
235	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	April 19	The grievances which disturb the United States, and alienate it from Great Britain, seem deducible from concessions to insurgents. Instructs Mr. Adams to furnish British government with accumulating evidence of purpose of United States to preserve the Union. Responsibility for future alienation between the two countries cannot rest with the President.	242

DEMAND FOR REVOCATION OF REBEL BELLIGERENCY—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
146	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.	1862. April 28	Bullock's projected expedition from England is regarded as a piratical invasion of the United States. Would it not be well for France to signify her aversion to designs of European conspirators.	243
240	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	April 28	Capture of New Orleans. Bullock's proposed expedition leads to reflection that European powers are willing that the suppression of the insurrection should be associated with conviction that sympathies of Europe were lent to abortive revolution.	243
148	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.	May 1	President's mitigation of blockade. Incloses copy of correspondence with Mr. Adams in regard to subscription among merchants in Liverpool to aid insurgents. If true neutrality was observed by foreign powers domestic strife would soon terminate.	244
245	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	May 5	Successes of Union arms, simultaneous preparation to mitigate blockade, and ratification of treaty for suppression of African slave trade. President requests attention of Earl Russell may be called to position of Great Britain in regard to recognition of insurgents as belligerents	244
149	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.	May 5	Opening of New Orleans to mails and commerce. A speedy termination of the war depends upon withdrawal of belligerent rights conceded to insurgents by foreign powers.	245
151do	May 7	The issue of proclamation for the restoration of commerce at New Orleans may be regarded as announcement that United States has passed danger of disunion. French neutrality and friendship.	246
159	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	May 15	Communication to Lord Russell of success of Union arms, and of the growing feeling of irritation towards Great Britain. Lord Russell replies that large portion of country remains unconquered, and that hostile sentiment had always existed in America. Mr. Adams cites instances in experience of his family that show causes of unfriendly feeling between the two countries.	247
147	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	May 16	He awaits still further change for the better condition of affairs in United States before urging again the revocation of concession to insurgents of belligerent rights.	248
164	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	May 22	In reply to request, in view of recent Union successes, to revoke belligerent rights accorded to insurgents, Lord Russell replies that he does not see his way to a change of policy. In reply to reproach that insurgents obtained arms and money in England, Lord Russell says that United States have availed themselves of same opportunity. Mr. Adams said that the practice had been discontinued.	249
149	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	May 22	Has communicated to Mr. Thouvenel desire of the United States for the revocation of belligerent rights accorded to the insur-	251

DEMAND FOR REVOCATION OF REBEL BELLIGERENCY—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
		1862.		
154	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	June 2	Revo- gents. Mr. Thouvenel refers to military situation and future of the South, disposition of the cotton crop, and the impossibility of acting upon the proposition for withdrawal of belligerency without previous conference with England. Mr. Dayton suggests that France may signify her aversion to plots of insurgent conspirators in England. Mr. Thouvenel admits that they cannot be justified. Suggests co-operation with Lord Lyons and Mr. Mercier to obtain revocation of neutrality decree.	253
163	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.	June 3	Revocation by France of concession of belligerent rights depends entirely upon existence of present understanding with England.	253
272	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	June 9	Reasons for withdrawal by France of her recognition of insurgent belligerency. Regrets refusal of England to reconsider its attitude towards United States. Relations with maritime powers may be debated in Congress.	256
167	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.	June 20	Regrets determination of France not to rescind belligerency accorded to insurgents. Change of position of maritime powers is necessary to full restoration of commerce with Europe.	256
178do.....	July 10	United States have redressed every complaint made by foreign governments, and only complain because neutrality encouraging to rebellion has not been repealed.	257
303	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	July 18	Recognition by maritime powers of internal enemy as belligerent, illicit British trade and sympathies of Europe counteract efforts of United States to terminate war.	257
195	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	Sept. 13	Discussion of reception of insurgent emissaries by French government with Mr. Thouvenel.	258
359	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Sept. 26	Political interests of European states are modifying agreement between England and France to act in accord upon questions issuing from American insurrection.	259
373do.....	Oct. 20	Remonstrance against the British government permitting hostile expeditions to be fitted out in her ports.	259
418do.....	Dec. 8	In regard to the intimation in the communication from Earl Russell of the belief that the United States are more tolerant of real or apparent injury from France than from Great Britain.	260
		1863.		
355	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Mar. 26	Inclosing speeches made in the House of Lords on the 23d instant on American affairs. Tone of Lord Russell's reply.	262
336	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.	April 24	Though France unnecessarily recognized insurgent belligerency, the United States appreciate their observance of neutrality.	262
609	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	July 30	Review of insurgent situation; the encouragement it has received from maritime powers of Europe. Action of England in regard to cruisers; of France in proposing a recog-	263

DEMAND FOR REVOCATION OF REBEL BELLIGERENCY—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
		1863.		
	Mr. Seward to Lord Lyons.	Aug. 4	dition of insurgent independence. Consequences of general war.	
676	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Aug. 10	Case of the General Rusak	268
			Speculations concerning reasons for English animosity against United States.	268
Cir.do	Aug. 12	In view of military success of Union arms, the quickest way for foreign maritime powers, who seek commercial prosperity through restoration of peace in America, to gain that end is to withdraw support from insurgents, and leave adjustment of insurrection to the people of the United States.	269
729do	Oct. 5	The preparation of hostile expeditions in England is regarded as fruit of neutrality proclamation. The United States refuse to be derogated to equality with insurgents by any act of British government.	270
702do	Nov. 17	Insurgent plots in Canada a consequence of neutrality proclamation. Proceedings of the insurgents as disturbers of the public peace at home and abroad.	270
771do	Nov. 30	Reasons for revoking belligerent rights accorded to the insurgents.	271
		1864.		
802do	Jan. 6	Case of Rappahannock. Enlistment of pirates, and equipment of ships of war by British subjects in British waters press United States to ask if Great Britain will put an end to such intolerable practices inconsistent with her neutrality.	272
580	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Jan. 21	Incloses copy of communication to Lord Russell in regard to issue by insurgents of naturalization papers to aliens on board vessels that never have been within insurgent jurisdiction.	273
838	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Feb. 8.	Commending the communication to Lord Russell of insurgent naturalization of aliens at sea.	275
596	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Feb. 12	Incloses Lord Russell's note in regard to Mallory's report, and to charge that British dominion is base for insurgent operations.	275
843	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Feb. 13	The interest of Great Britain is to be found in change of policy towards United States.	276
602	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Feb. 19	Inclosing Mr. Adams's note to Lord Russell in regard to extraordinary facilities insurgents derive from British neutrality.	277
861	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Mar. 3	Regrets that Lord Russell still thinks that necessity exists for regarding insurgents as belligerents.	278
869do	Mar. 41	Thinks that France and England would recede rather than go further in the line of favor to the insurgents.	278
950do	May 18	Satisfaction with the vindication in Parliament of the proceedings in the case of the Tuscaloosa, instituted to preserve British neutrality.	278

DEMAND FOR REVOCATION OF REBEL BELLIGERENCY—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
1068	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	1864. Aug. 15	Increase of emigration is dependent upon recognition of insurgent belligerency by European states.	279
	Earl Russell to Lord Lyons.	Nov. 26	Reviews the demand of the United States upon the British government for a relinquishment of their belligerent recognition of the insurgents, and the reasons for not acceding to it.	279
823	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Dec. 1	Incloses the London Times containing Lord Russell's letter to the three rebel commissioners, announcing determination of British government to maintain its neutrality.	282
1201	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Dec. 26	Has received Lord Russell's letter to rebel emissaries, and says if British government were less just, United States would raise question upon the extraordinary communication.	283
886	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	1865. Mar. 2	Appointment of Sir Frederick Bruce as minister to United States, and indications of British policy to be drawn therefrom.	283
1296	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Mar. 10	Apprehension prevailing in Great Britain that the close of insurrection will be followed by inauguration of war upon England through Canada.	284
1302do.....	Mar. 13	Case of the Stonewall.....	286
910	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Mar. 30	Will urge upon Lord Russell the necessity of withdrawing British recognition of insurgent belligerency. Resumé of public opinion in England on Canadian affairs.	286
1336	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Apr. 4	Conciliatory tone is preserved by United States, but alienation is encouraged by continued recognition of insurgents as belligerents.	287
1337do.....	April 4	Incloses Mr. Burnley's note informing United States of discharge of St. Albans raiders, and of their subsequent arrest on charge of violating Queen's neutrality.	288
115	Mr. Seward to Mr. Potter.	Mar. 21	Can go no further in way of conciliating Canada until there is some show of reciprocity.	288
	Notice.....	April 4	Reward offered for arrest of invaders of territory of United States.	289
917	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	April 7	Will communicate to British government remonstrance against course of British government in continuing to recognize rebels as belligerents.	289
927do.....	April 13	Incloses copy of a note addressed to Lord Russell in regard to the Sea King, and remonstrating against continued recognition of insurgents as belligerents.	290
1394	Mr. Hunter to Mr. Adams.	May 5	In view of military news the withdrawal of belligerent rights by Great Britain is expected.	293
952	Mr. Adams to Mr. Hunter.	May 11	Incloses Lord Russell's note of May 4 in regard to reply of Mr. Adams to application of Portugal in 1818, for redress, quoted as precedent in case of the Sea King. Upon the relinquishment by United States of right to search British vessels, depends action of British government in regard to insurgent belligerency.	294

DEMAND FOR REVOCATION OF REBEL BELLIGERENCY—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
1401	Mr. Hunter to Mr. Adams.	1865. May 15	The arrival of the Stonewall at Nassau induces President to press upon British government necessity of withdrawing their recognition of rebel belligerency. Incloses note to Sir Frederick Bruce upon that subject.	301
960	Mr. Adams to Mr. Hunter.	May 18	Incloses London Times containing ministerial replies to inquiries concerning withdrawal from insurgents of belligerent rights.	303
963do	May 25	Restrictions concerning sojourn of national vessels in British and French ports have been withdrawn; withdrawal of belligerent rights depends on renunciation by United States of right to search neutral vessels at sea. Suggests possession by force of Galveston and Rio Grande to prevent illicit trade.	303
964do	May 25	Incloses his reply of 20th to Lord Russell's note of 4th instant. The precipitate recognition of insurgents as belligerents, and the flagrant abuse of neutrality by the insurgents in British waters without satisfactory prevention by British government, justify United States in claiming reparation.	303
	Sir F. Bruce to Earl Russell.	May 26	Incloses proclamation of President opening all seaports except those of Texas. Reasons for expecting early removal of all restrictions upon trade.	317
	Earl Russell to Earl Cowley.	May 30	Suggestions as to an arrangement for simultaneous withdrawal by England and France of belligerent rights accorded to insurgents.	318
	Earl Cowley to Earl Russell.	May 31	Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys suggests the addition to the arrangement proposed that Confederate vessels may be disarmed and sold in British and French waters.	320
	Earl Russell to Sir F. Bruce.	June 2	Recognizes the termination of war in United States and withdraws recognition of insurgent belligerency modified by regulations concerning disposition of insurgent property in British waters.	320
	Earl Russell to Earl Cowley.	June 2	Any insurgent vessels found in British ports after termination of war properly revert to United States, but all counter claims to such property must be decided in courts of law.	322
975	Mr. Adams to Mr. Hunter.	June 2	Alarm in England at alleged imperious demand of United States for reparation of damages by vessels fitted out in England. An alliance between France and England against United States is suggested by insurgent emissaries and French and British sympathizers with rebellion.	323
	Sir J. Crampton to Earl Russell.	June 6	Incloses royal decree of Spain abrogating decree of 17th of June, 1861, by which insurgents were recognized as belligerents.	324
963	Mr. Adams to Mr. Hunter.	June 8	Incloses copy of Lord Russell's note to lords commissioners of admiralty of 2d instant, announcing withdrawal of belligerent rights from insurgents, and comments thereon.	325

PORT REGULATIONS.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
	Earl Cowley to Earl Russell.	1865. June 13	Incloses extract from the <i>Moniteur</i> stating that imperial government will no longer recognize belligerents in North America.	327
	Earl Russell to Sir F. Bruce.	June 16	Reduction of Galveston having been accomplished by United States, it will not be necessary to point out the clause in President's proclamation which threatens certain offenders as pirates.	328
	Sir F. Bruce to Earl Russell.	June 19	Incloses Mr. Seward's reply to Lord Russell's dispatch of the 2d instant. Mr. Seward regrets the consultation of British with French government before recognizing restoration of peace in United States; that the twenty-four-hour rule is still in force; and that there is a reservation, in favor of insurgent vessels of war; and protests against allowing insurgent vessels to leave British ports. The United States regard the right of search as having come to an end.	328
1464	Mr. Hunter to Mr. Adams.	June 26	Incloses President's proclamation rescinding blockade.	331
	Earl Russell to Sir F. Bruce.	July 1	Approves the decision in the case of the <i>Retribution</i> , and assents to the position that a commissioned ship of an enemy cannot, during the continuance of the war, be relieved from condemnation in a prize court of the other belligerent, by sale to a neutral.	331
	Earl Russell to Sir F. Bruce.	July 6	In regard to the objections of Mr. Seward to the apparent concessions to the insurgents in the instrument rescinding belligerent rights.	332

PORT REGULATIONS.

	Lord Lyons to Lord Russell.	1861. May 11	Is informed that southern congress declared war and authorized issue of letters of marque. Incloses his dispatch to Rear-Admiral Milne.	333
Ord.	Secretary of colonies to governor of Canada.	June 1	Announcing British neutrality and interdiction of prizes in British ports.	334
	Lord Russell to Lord Lyons.	June 1	Incloses note to lords commissioners of admiralty in regard to interdiction of prizes in British ports.	335
	Messrs. Yancey, Rost and Mann to Earl Russell.	Aug. 14	Requesting British recognition of Confederate independence and objecting to interdiction of their prizes in British ports.	336
84	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Sept. 10	Incloses dispatch from Mr. Bernard, of Trinidad, showing connivance of island authorities with insurgent privateer <i>Sumter</i> . Directs that the British government be requested to prevent similar occurrence in future.	337
53	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Oct. 4	Incloses copies of two notes addressed to Lord Russell in regard to violation of neutrality in British West Indian Islands.	338

PORT REGULATIONS—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
		1861.		
58	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Oct. 11	Incloses Lord Russell's reply in regard to allegations that British neutrality had been violated in West Indian Islands.	339
112	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Oct. 29	President does not regard Lord Russell's explanation of affair at Trinidad as satisfactory, and hopes that Great Britain will reconsider question involved.	340
	Lord Lyons to Earl Russell.	Nov. 4	In regard to reception of insurgent privateers in English and Dutch ports.	341
	Do.....	Nov. 9	Mr. Seward requests Lord Lyons to suggest to British government the adoption of the twenty-four-hour rule which had been adopted by all other powers of Europe.	342
122	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Nov. 11	Great Britain is only government which extends unlimited hospitality to insurgent privateers, and requests the reconsideration of their position.	343
	Earl Russell to Lord Lyons.	Nov. 22	Asserts that Mr. Seward never chooses to understand position of British government. As a neutral it will treat insurgent vessels in same manner as vessels of United States.	343
93	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Dec. 20	Lord Russell says that supplies in all instances furnished insurgent vessels in British ports came from individuals and not the government. The time of stay prescribed in British regulation was substantially the same as that in foreign ports.	34
		1862.		
196	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Feb. 27	Requests serious consideration by Lord Russell of the preparation in British waters of a fleet of piratical privateers to depredate upon American commerce.	344
137	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Mar. 27	Incloses copies of three notes received by him from Lord Russell in regard to the refusal of the authorities at Nassau to permit United States vessel of war Flambéau to coal at that port, and an extension of the privilege to a merchant vessel of the insurgents.	346
	Earl Russell to Lord Lyons.	Feb. 1	Incloses copy of letter addressed to lords commissioners of the admiralty with regard to the rules to preserve strict neutrality of England as commanded to be observed in all ports in British jurisdiction.	348
233	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	April 16	Approval of proceedings of the governor at Nassau in case of Flambéau by British government is considered unfriendly by President. Inconvenience to legitimate commerce is sufficient reason for revision of British proclamation of neutrality.	351
275do.....	June 23	Removal of American ship of war Saginaw from Hong Kong may be communicated to Earl Russell as illustration of injurious operation of British neutrality.	351
188	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	July 17	Incloses note to Lord Russell in regard to the exclusion from Hong Kong of the United States vessel Saginaw, and accompanies it with copies of all papers in case.	352
198do.....	July 31	Incloses copies of additional correspondence between himself and Lord Russell in regard to Saginaw.	354

PORT REGULATIONS—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
324	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	1862. Aug. 14	As he never expects to hear of insurgent vessels in Chinese waters, he deems exclusion of American vessels unnecessary.	355
534	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	1863. Nov. 13	As the British and French government have recognized insurgents as belligerents, the refusal to receive their vessels would involve necessity of refusing to receive those of United States.	355
	Earl Russell to Lord Lyons.	Nov. 28	Lord Palmerston says that England would not permit interference with any vessels within British waters, but in regard to vessels met at sea the British government would not dispute the belligerent right of search.	356
611	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	1864. Mar. 10	Incloses debate in Parliament in regard to rebel operations on the ocean.	357
671	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Mar. 11	Requests reconsideration by British government of policy which permits abuse of neutrality by insurgent emissaries in British ports and provinces. Cases of Tuscaloosa and Chesapeake.	357
669	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	April 23	Mr. Burlingame telegraphs that Chinese government has forbidden insurgent cruisers to enter its waters.	359
721do.....	June 16	Incloses note from Lord Russell objecting to the entrance of United States vessel of war Toga in colonial ports, and communicating a copy of English port regulations and of his reply on the subject.	359
723do.....	June 17	Incloses instructions of British government to governors of colonies respecting treatment of prizes in British waters, and statement of number and tonnage of American vessels sold to British subjects in 1863.	364
	Mr. Burnley to Mr. Seward.	Sept. 9	Orders in council regulating anchorage of vessels of war of United States, and of insurgents in harbor of Halifax.	365
	Do.....	Sept. 23	Incloses order of British government prohibiting sale or dismantling of United States or insurgent vessels in English ports.	366
1310	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	1865. Mar. 20	Departure of Lord Lyons and appointment of Sir Frederick Bruce. Though spirit which animates intercourse with Great Britain is friendly, the United States cannot defer claiming removal of European regulations which deny safety to mercantile marine upon the ocean and reciprocity for our navy in European waters.	366
1350	Mr. F. W. Seward to Mr. Adams.	April 12	Incloses proclamations: 1. Closing certain southern ports as ports of entry. 2. Opening Key West to commerce. 3. Refusing privileges in United States ports to those vessels of foreign governments which deny similar privileges to vessels of United States in their ports.	367
1404	Mr. Hunter to Mr. Adams.	May 16	Incloses President's proclamation in regard to insurgent cruisers.	370
902	Mr. Adams to Mr. Hunter.	May 19	Incloses correspondence between Earl Russell and lord's commissioners of the admiralty	370

PORT REGULATIONS—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
		1865.	in regard to desired revocation of order of January, 1862, regulating visits of United States ships of war to British ports.	
973	Mr. Adams to Mr. Hunter.	June 2	Has communicated to Lord Russell proclamation of President of May 10, 1865, in regard to the reception by insurgent vessels of hospitalities in foreign ports, and has received Lord Russell's reply.	371
977do.....	June 2	Lord Russell says that Great Britain does not mean to be impatient about restoration of commerce in ports that United States had right to close, and that insurgent vessels now upon the sea would not be admitted in British ports.	373
Cir.	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	June 7	Admiral Goldsborough is instructed not to enter any foreign port unless necessary, where belligerent rights are extended to rebels and naval honors withheld from United States flag.	374
990	Mr. Adams to Mr. Hunter.	June 15	Incloses debate in House of Lords on President's proclamation closing ports in Texas. Though United States ceases to carry on war, it does not debar itself from the right to pursue on the ocean vessels without national character.	375
1454	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	June 19	Incloses copy of correspondence with Sir Frederick Bruce, and of letter to Secretary of Navy, on subject of withdrawal of concession of belligerent rights to insurgents.	375
1473do.....	July 3	Incloses letter of Secretary of Navy to Rear-Admiral Goldsborough in regard to effect upon naval intercourse of the withdrawal by Great Britain of concession to insurgents of belligerent rights.	380
1485do.....	July 25	Expresses hope that Mr. Adams has been guided by instruction which refers to disposition to be made of a certain class of vessels found in British ports.	381
1491do.....	July 25	Incloses correspondence with Sir Frederick Bruce in regard to Earl Russell's extension of twenty-four-hour rule to insurgent vessels to be found in British ports upon termination of insurgent belligerency.	381
1495	Mr. Hunter to Mr. Adams.	July 28	Disposition of the Rappahannock suggests that England adopt the course of Spain.	383
	Mr. Moran to Mr. Seward.	July 28	Incloses information concerning case of United States vs. Prioleau in British courts.	383
1025	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Aug. 3	Incloses full report of proceedings in court of chancery in case of cotton claimed by United States.	384
1033do.....	Aug. 10	Has instituted proceedings for recovery of insurgent vessels in British waters.	384
1507	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Aug. 10	Views of United States as to their rights in the case of United States vs. Prioleau, the subject of interlocutory decree of Vice-Chancellor Wood.	385
1509do.....	Aug. 12	Secretary of Navy instructs Rear-Admiral Goldsborough, as Great Britain still adheres to twenty-four-hour rule, to avoid English ports, and decline to exchange naval courtesies with British vessels of war.	386

PROPOSITIONS FOR MEDIATION AND INTERVENTION.

No.	From and To.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
1066	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	1865. Oct. 14	Incloses information that all restrictions on vessels of war of United States are removed in British ports, and that Admiral Denman has been requested to capture Shenandoah.	386
	Sir F. Bruce to Mr. Seward.	Oct. 30	All restrictive measures have been removed from United States vessels in British waters.	387
1572	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Oct. 31	As Great Britain has removed all restrictions upon vessels of United States in British waters, the Secretary of the Navy has been requested to rescind instructions to naval officers to discriminate in regard to their visits in British ports.	388
	Mr. Seward to Sir F. Bruce.	Oct. 31	Will express through Mr. Adams satisfaction of United States with removal of restrictions by Great Britain.	389

PROPOSITIONS FOR MEDIATION AND INTERVENTION.

333	Mr. Dallas to Mr. Seward.	1861. May 2	Postponement of Mr. Gregory's motion in House of Commons for recognition of southern confederation.	391
1	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	May 17	Postponement of Mr. Gregory's motion until 7th June.	391
5	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	May 22	M. Thouvenel says that Emperor felt disposed to tender his good offices to United States.	391
	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	June 8	Incloses debate terminating Mr. Gregory's motion in the House of Commons.	392
15	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	June 8	Foreign intervention, aid, and sympathy for insurgents can only protract war.	392
16do.....	June 8	United States court will order restitution of part of cargo of Winifred, owned by British subjects.	392
13	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.	June 8	In regard to tender of good offices by Emperor.	393
26do.....	July 6	Gratification with the disposition of insurgent application for recognition by French government.	394
43	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Sept. 14	Impression of insurgent emissaries that a maintenance of their struggle for three months longer will be rewarded by recognition. Active preparations for sustaining defense.	395
46do.....	Sept. 19	British government will wait development of pending military preparations before considering recognition.	395
125	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Nov. 14	Toleration of revolutionary emissaries in England and France.	396
136do.....	Nov. 30	Incidents permitted by British policy which have tendency to bring United States and England into collision. England has become source of insurgent supplies. It has improperly communicated with rebel leaders at Richmond, and insurgent vessels receive privileges in its ports.	396

XXXVIII RECOGNITION OF REBEL BELLIGERENCY.

PROPOSITIONS FOR MEDIATION AND INTERVENTION—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
157	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	1862. Jan. 2	Incloses dispatch No. 97 to Mr. Dayton in regard to expectation, in view of the rigorous blockade, of demonstration in favor of recognition of insurgents in England and France. Mr. Dayton is requested to assure Mr. Thouvenel that the need of a blockade will not continue very long.	397
168do.....	Jan. 23	Will await the threatened development of purpose of portion of British people to induce their government to aid insurgents.	398
106	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Jan. 24	The manner of manufacturing sympathy in Europe for insurgents, and encouraging development of plans for interference in American affairs.	399
178	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Feb. 4	Has information that Parliament and Chambers are to be pressed into discussions designed to induce Great Britain and France to recognize insurgents.	399
112	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Feb. 7	Favorable sentiment shown in Queen's speech to Parliament, and in debate, toward United States.	400
186	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Feb. 17	Communicating details showing efficiency of blockade, and tabular statement from Mr. Shufeldt, consul general at Havana, showing nationality of vessels that have run through.	400
191do.....	Feb. 19	Aspect of affairs which caused apprehension of foreign intervention has changed.	403
148	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	April 25	Friendly sentiment toward United States fluctuates with character of news received. Suppressed sympathy. Applications for recognition.	404
	Lord Lyons to Earl Russell.	May 16	Mr. Seward's views in regard to the continuance of the blockade, and the wishes of the United States in regard to the cotton supply; he places no confidence in report that France and England are in communication for purposes of intervening in American affairs.	404
260	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	May 28	The statement that thirty blockade runners have gathered at Nassau to await the opening of ports and the withdrawal from the ocean of pirates depredating on American commerce and seeking shelter in British ports, induces him, under direction of President, to confer, if representatives abroad shall think discreet, with friendly nations upon prospects of war and their future course in regard to it. Reasons for such a course showing condition of insurgent and prospect of Union cause.	405
160	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	June 12	There are important rumors prevailing that if proffered intervention of France and England should be rejected, a recognition will follow, to be succeeded by active intervention to stop the war. Inquiries in regard to definition of contraband as applied to open ports.	410
176	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	June 20	Has given to Lord Russell substance of Mr. Seward's No. 260. Lord Russell attaches but little importance to tender of Mr.	411

PROPOSITIONS FOR MEDIATION AND INTERVENTION—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
		1862.		
287	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	July 5	Lindsay's motion in the House of Commons for recognition. Approves submission of his dispatch No. 260 to Lord Russell. Advocates of African slavery and its opponents are acting in concert to precipitate servile war.	411
168	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	July 9	Constant advance in price of cotton incites agitation of intervention by Emperor in American affairs. Unfair tone of journals under control of French government.	412
178	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.	July 10	Increased activity of European politicians with a view to provoke intervention in American affairs, is an inducement to ask foreign governments to consider position, interests, and purposes and character of United States. Reviews the subject.	412
185	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	July 11	Will report now ground proposed to be taken by ministers on American question in debate on Mr. Lindsay's motion.	414
186do.....	July 17	Fate of Mr. Lindsay's motion for recognition of insurgent independence.	414
	Mr. Mason to Earl Russell.	July 17	Favorable sentiment of the confederate government in regard to the proposed mediation by England in American affairs. Quotes Lord Palmerston's statement of views of British government.	415
	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	July 19	Sympathy in England with proposals for recognition, and expectation of final division of United States. Success of proposals for recognition of insurgent independence depends upon military movements in United States.	416
	Earl Russell to Mr. Mason.	July 24	Is of the opinion that any proposal to United States to recognize southern confederacy would irritate United States, and proposal to Confederate States to return to the Union would irritate the confederates.	417
	Mr. Mason to Earl Russell.	July 24	Reasons for recognizing independence of confederacy.	417
	Do.....	July 24	Requests an interview.....	418
	Earl Russell to Mr. Mason.	July 31	Will submit draught of reply to Mr. Mason's note of 24th to cabinet. Declines interview.	418
197	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	July 31	Insurgent reports of willingness of France to recognize independence of confederacy, and British sentiment in relation to same subject.	419
	Mr. Mason to Earl Russell.	Aug. 1	Reasons for recognition of confederate independence.	419
314	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Aug. 2	Though British nation desire dismemberment of United States, it is not believed that any practical measure of recognition will be executed by British government, and reasons therefor.	421
178	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	Aug. 2	States that the report that England, France, and Russia are to offer, separately, mediation to the United States, conflicts with information from other quarters.	424
	Earl Russell to Mr. Mason.	Aug. 2	Reasons for conclusion that the time has not yet arrived to recognize independence of confederacy.	425
332	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Aug. 13	Disbelief of any intention on the part of France to intervene in affairs of United States.	426

PROPOSITIONS FOR MEDIATION AND INTERVENTION—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
		1862.	The United States, for forbearance upon part of foreign nations, rely upon following reasons: 1st, that the United States will not entertain any foreign mediation in domestic affairs; 2d, that no one would predict that more supplies of grain, gold, and cotton would be furnished in case of war with foreign nations than now; 3d, vigorous and successful preparations for continuing the war would not permit such an anticipation.	
	Mr. Stuart to Earl Russell.	Aug. 16	Has read Lord Russell's note to Mr. Seward in regard to British opinion of progress of war.	427
Cir.	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Aug. 18	Reasons for inadmissibility of foreign intervention in affairs of United States.	427
208	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Aug. 22	In regard to the method adopted by Lord Russell to notice reasons assigned by Mr. Seward in No. 260 for revocation of belligerent rights and change of policy towards United States. It is reported that change was under consideration, but failure of attack on Richmond caused its rejection in British cabinet. Incloses Lord Russell's note to Mr. Stuart.	431
211do.....	Aug. 29	The idea of intervention loses strength in England.	433
189	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	Sept. 3	Improbability of interference by Emperor in affairs of United States.	433
336	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Sept. 8	Comments upon extraordinary manner Lord Russell adopted to notice appeal contained in instruction No. 260, in regard to future course of foreign nations towards United States.	434
338do.....	Sept. 9	Incloses No. 207 to Mr. Dayton in regard to conversation in which Mr. Seward denies Mr. Mercier's affirmation that events seem to indicate that Union must be divided into two confederacies. Mutual assurances concerning acceptability of Mr. Dayton as medium of diplomatic intercourse with France. Mr. Seward instructs Mr. Dayton to converse with Mr. Thouvenel in regard to Mr. Mercier's statements.	435
229	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Oct. 3	Effect of victory at Antietam upon public sentiment in England. Is of the opinion that sympathies of majority of poorer classes in England are with the Union.	438
234	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.	Oct. 8	Appreciates Mr. Thouvenel's caudor. Moderation does not affect sentiments of insurgents who are bent upon reducing the country to complete chaos. Undoubted capacity of United States to conquer, and evident weakness of the society of the Gulf States.	439
368	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Oct. 10	Mr. Dayton's conversation with Mr. Thouvenel indicates harmony in despondency between Mr. Mercier and himself, but no unfriendliness. Proposed consideration by French government of American question. Encouraging prospect for United States. Neither foreign war nor failure to maintain the Union is apprehended by United States.	440

PROPOSITIONS FOR MEDIATION AND INTERVENTION—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
		1862.		
208	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	Oct. 14	Reception of President's proclamation abolishing slavery, and its probable effect upon public in Europe.	441
372	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Oct. 18	Desponding situation in insurgent States. Though the President never would recognize relations of friendship with any power which shall lend its aid to foreign intervention, he is confident that they now could not endanger the Union.	441
376do.....	Oct. 21	Incloses copy of following dispatch No. 237.	442
237	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.	Oct. 20	Has information that Great Britain and France are to consider question of recognition of insurgents as sovereign state. Reasons for considering such recognition unnecessary and unfriendly.	442
248	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Oct. 24	Lord Russell says that Mr. Gladstone's speech was not meant to indicate any change in the neutral policy England had adopted in regard to American war. Mr. Adams received same assurances from Russian ambassador, but is of opinion that a victory in Virginia can alone check current of public sentiment.	446
250do.....	Oct. 28	Incloses extract from Globe in regard to departure of Lord Lyons for America, and the probability that no interference in American affairs will be attempted.	448
387	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Nov. 4	Trusts in capacity of United States to undeceive those who desire a collision in regard to domestic insurrection.	450
389do.....	Nov. 4	Review of European sentiment concerning foreign intervention in American war.	450
220	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	Nov. 6	Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys says that intention of French government was comprised in wish to be useful if acceptable to both parties.	451
302	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Nov. 10	Expresses satisfaction that the expectation of the insurgents, incited by Gladstone's speech, that Great Britain would give them aid has proved unfounded. Reviews situation.	452
259	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Nov. 13	Publication of correspondence of France with England and Russia, proposing intervention in American affairs, and speculations thereon.	453
261do.....	Nov. 15	Decisive answer of Lord Russell in reply to French note tendering good offices to United States. Russian reply.	454
	Earl Russell to Earl Cowley.	Nov. 13	In reply to the statement that circumstances attending prosecution of the war warrant the Emperor of the French in believing that time has arrived for maritime powers to offer their good offices to belligerents in America for suspension of hostilities, Lord Russell says that there is no ground, at present, to hope that the federal government would accept the proposal suggested.	455
227	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	Nov. 18	Incloses his note to Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys calling attention to errors in regard to American military situation in published communication to French ambassadors in	457

PROPOSITIONS FOR MEDIATION AND INTERVENTION—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
		1862.		
264	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Nov. 21	England and Russia, inviting intervention in America. Informs Lord Russell of his conviction of the uncertainty of the Emperor's disposition towards United States, and his confidence in the policy of the British ministry to the extent it had been declared. Lord Russell refers to rumors concerning opinion in the United States in regard to the proposed intervention and to the Emperor's reception of Mr. Sidel.	461
231	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	Nov. 25	Incloses Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys's note of Nov. 23 in regard to the Emperor's offer of mediation, and determination in view of its failure to cease from a further pressure, but France will be always willing, either singly or in concert with other powers, to aid in bringing about a reconciliation between belligerents in United States.	462
261	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.	Nov. 28	States that Mr. Mercier has not had the least warrant from authority of United States for representing that President would entertain any proposition in regard to action of United States in its domestic affairs.	463
	Lord Lyons to Earl Russell.	Nov. 28	Receipt of correspondence in regard to French invitation to intervene in American affairs. Unanimity of public press in repudiating foreign intervention.	464
414	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Nov. 30	In regard to receipt of invitation of France to European maritime powers to intervene in American affairs. Incloses No. 263 to Mr. Dayton or subject.	464
263	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.	Nov. 30	Opinion entertained by United States of the Emperor's invitation to England and France to offer their mediation in American affairs. Its failure removes necessity for discussing propriety or necessity of the proceeding.	464
	Lord Lyons to Earl Russell.	Dec. 2	Mr. Seward has informed him, though United States is not called upon to give any opinion on subject of French proposition for mediation, that if any European powers desire to offer any explanations the United States will respectfully receive them.	466
265	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.	Dec. 5	As course of President in regard to the late French proposition has been indicated, necessity for a review of Mr. Dayton's note to Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys is removed.	466
418	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Dec. 8	Popular judgment in United States ascribes invitation of Emperor to England and Russia, to mediate in American affairs, to hostile and aggressive designs. President, not accepting this opinion, deems the proceeding based upon erroneous assumption in regard to military and naval condition of United States. Determination of people and Congress to hold country in defense against foreign intervention has been intensified.	466
271	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Dec. 11	Exertions of insurgents in England are rewarded by cotton loan, and strong political interest in their favor.	467

PROPOSITIONS FOR MEDIATION AND INTERVENTION—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
		1862.		
268	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.	Dec. 11	Directs Mr. Dayton to communicate satisfaction of President with frank explanation of Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys, in reply to Mr. Dayton's note upon subject of tender of good offices to procure cessation of hostilities in America.	468
	Earl Russell to Lord Lyons.	Dec. 19	Instructs him to communicate to Mr. Seward that distress in Lancashire for cotton will furnish him with reasons enough for discussion of American question in Europe.	469
246	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	Dec. 23	Reasons for communicating to Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys statement of military condition of United States, without instructions.	469
278	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.	Dec. 29	Relations between United States and France. Their delicate nature, and liability to interruption by attempt of France to dictate to United States, grounded on supposed sympathy of certain local party with France.	470
		1863.		
	Lord Lyons to Earl Russell.	Jan. 7	Has informed Mr. Seward, in reply to his remark that European powers were discussing American affairs without consulting United States, that distress in Lancashire was reason enough for the discussion.	470
283	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.	Jan. 9	Approving Mr. Dayton's note to Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys of November 16, 1862.	471
255	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	Jan. 15	Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys will direct Mr. Mercier to suggest to United States appointment of commissioners to treat with South for Union and peace. Statement of terms of proposition.	471
	M. Drouyn de Lhuys to M. Mercier.	Jan. 9	Reasons for suggesting informal conference with authorities that represent the South for the purpose of restoring peace, and directing that such proposition be made to United States.	471
465	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Feb. 2	Public concern in regard to supposed benevolent idea of French mediation in American affairs.	473
316	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Feb. 6	Inclosing Queen's speech on opening of Parliament.	474
297	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.	Feb. 6	Mr. Mercier has communicated Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys's suggestion that United States shall hold informal conferences with authorities that represent the South. President's reasons for disapproving the plan.	474
481	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Feb. 16	Incloses copy of instruction No. 302 to Mr. Dayton.	478
302	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.	Feb. 16	Has no doubt that French tender of good offices was the fruit of disloyal communications from United States. Indications of increased health in public sentiment promises strength to the government.	478
337	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Feb. 26	Effect upon public opinion in England of a reported misunderstanding between Mr. Mercier and Mr. Seward. Military success of United States would remove all insurgent sympathy, except that found in interested commercial circles.	479
277	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	Feb. 26	Has communicated to Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys negative answer of United States to proposal of French government for informal	479

PROPOSITIONS FOR MEDIATION AND INTERVENTION—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
		1863.	conferences between United States and southern authorities.	
292	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	Mar. 27	Has communicated to Mr. Dronyn de Lhuys concurrent resolutions of Congress concerning foreign intervention in the existing rebellion.	480
356	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Mar. 27	Has communicated to Lord Russell resolutions of Congress in regard to foreign intervention.	480
547	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	April 10	In regard to satisfactory termination of results of improper advice given by citizens of United States to foreign powers in regard to propriety of foreign mediation.	481
627 do	June 15	Consequences of foreign intervention	481
438	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	June 26	Motion of Mr. Roebuck assigned for 30th instant in House of Commons. Conference of Messrs. Lindsay and Roebuck with Emperor at Paris.	482
439 do	June 26	Baron Gros has said that Emperor will renew proposition for recognition to British government, and if declined, will proceed alone.	482
441 do	July 1	Incloses debate in House of Commons on motion made by Mr. Roebuck and the implication of the Emperor of the French.	483
323	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	July 2	Mr. Dronyn de Lhuys says that Emperor did not authorize Mr. Roebuck's statement in House of Commons concerning willingness of France to recognize insurgents, and that no official communication upon the subject had passed between the English and French governments.	483
446	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	July 3	Effect of Mr. Roebuck's statement upon his political standing. The growing disposition in Great Britain to take action in favor of rebels is stimulated by insurgent emissaries. It can only be counteracted by success of Union arms.	484
647	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	July 9	Incloses copy of 368 to Mr. Dayton	485
368	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.	July 8	Renewal of proposition for moral action of European governments in domestic affairs of United States may be traced to insurgent emissaries. If such prove true, United States will regard action of France as unfriendly. Recent military successes of Union arms may induce Emperor to return to policy of neutrality and non-intervention. Directions for proceeding in case Emperor shall violate sovereignty of United States.	485
448	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	July 9	Assignment of Monday for continuance of discussion upon Mr. Roebuck's motion. Unfriendly opinion and sympathy in official circles concerning American affairs.	486
649	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	July 10	Inclosing instruction to Mr. Dayton in regard to French intervention in American civil war.	487
369	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.	July 10	In regard to the remarks of Baron Gros, French ambassador in London, as to the Emperor's intention to interfere in domestic affairs of United States. Mr. Dayton is requested to ask for a statement of Emperor's policy.	488

PROPOSITIONS FOR MEDIATION AND INTERVENTION—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
650	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	1863. July 11	Incloses Mr. Dayton's dispatch relative to recognition of insurgents.	489
321	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	June 26	Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys's assurances concerning intentions of Emperor. Importance of Mexican question and impossibility of accepting Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys's statements as final concerning policy of Emperor towards United States. Incloses Mr. Renauld's communication in La France concerning visit of Mr. Slidell to Emperor and the Roebuck motion for recognition.	489
370	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.	July 11	Receives information removing anxieties concerning foreign intervention.	490
452	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	July 16	Incloses debate on Mr. Roebuck's motion in Parliament.	491
374	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.	July 17	In regard to Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys's observations concerning reported conversation between the Emperor and Messrs. Roebuck and Lindsay. Incloses published correction of the report that British government had violated confidence in regard to French proposition for mediation.	491
656	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	July 18	Defers consideration of Roebuck motion until the answer of Great Britain is made to Mr. Roebuck's proposition.	492
329	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	July 30	Communicates result of conversation with Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys in regard to Baron Gros's statement, and to policy of Emperor upon subject of intervention in American affairs.	493
333 do	Aug. 5	Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys is not aware that British government have betrayed confidence in the manner indicated by Mr. Roebuck. Has received Mr. Seward's correction.	494
676	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Aug. 10	Animosity against United States in England, and its probable consequences.	495
334	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	Aug. 20	Conversation with Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys in regard to the Roebuck-Lindsay conference with the Emperor.	496
483	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Aug. 27	Incloses note to Lord Russell covering dispatch to Mr. Dayton in regard to the impropriety at the present juncture of affairs of extending aid to the rebels.	497
380	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.	July 29	Comments upon the Emperor's views of civil war in United States as expressed in the explanatory statement, published in the Moniteur, of the conversation with Messrs. Roebuck and Lindsay.	497
487	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Sept. 3	Incloses Lord Russell's reply to Mr. Adams in regard to impropriety at present time of permitting encouragement of civil war in America.	498
	Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys to Mr. Mercier.	Sept. 15	Relates substance of conversation with Mr. Dayton, in which he states that France had not recognized the South, nor signed with it any treaty for the cession of Louisiana and Texas; and that France neither sought for herself, nor for any other power, accessions in America.	499
733	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Oct. 9	Influence of insurgent intrigues upon stability of European policies in regard to United States.	500

PROPOSITIONS FOR MEDIATION AND INTERVENTION—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
816	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	1864. Jan. 15	Declaration that war in America and peace in Europe are guarantees of British security, and that close of war will be followed by preposterous demands by United States upon Great Britain. British policy has fostered insurgent intrigue, and that change of policy is necessary to prevent alienation and insure success of President's views.	501
823 do	Feb. 1	United States cannot now accept intervention on part of Great Britain to obtain concessions for insurgents.	503
853 do	Feb. 24	In regard to the Queen's speech and the debate thereon.	503
705	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	June 2	Management of Mr. Lindsay's motion for recognition.	504
725 do	June 23	Disposition of Mr. Lindsay's motion for recognition.	504
1012	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	June 27	Transmitting correspondence with Mr. Dayton relative to renewed effort between England and France to restore peace in United States.	504
496	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	June 10	Relative to suggestions for another effort between England and France to restore peace in United States.	505
592	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.	June 27	Does not credit reports of a renewed effort by England and France to restore peace in United States.	505
744	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	July 14	Intention of Mr. Lindsay to resuscitate in the Commons his motion for recognition.	506
751 do	July 21	Condition of public sentiment in England concerning American affairs, and elaborate movement to concentrate opinion in favor of intervention in civil war. Fate of insurgent intrigues in England.	506
1049	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	July 28	Comments upon parliamentary debate on resolution for ministerial censure so far as it bears upon the situation in the United States. Contrasts the conduct of the British Parliament with that of the United States during the war.	507
753	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	July 28	Fate of Mr. Lindsay's resuscitated motion. Incloses debate on the subject.	509
1058	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Aug. 1	Incloses copy of instruction to Mr. Dayton relative to report of new design of Emperor to propose mediation in civil war.	510
621	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.	Jul;	Foreign mediation in affairs of United States cannot be admitted.	510
1063	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Aug. 8	Acknowledges history of efforts of insurgents to procure from England recognition of their confederacy.	510
1245 do	1865. Jan. 23	Insurgents' hope of recognition based upon idea that rebels in late presidential election were prevented exercise of suffrage, therefore the next administration will not be <i>de jure</i> government over the States which by treaty of peace 1783 were acknowledged free, independent States. Incloses article from Richmond Sentinel.	511

GENERAL SUBJECT OF ENFORCEMENT OF NEUTRALITY.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Object.	Page.
		1861.		
30	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	June 28	Inclosing advertisements which indicate deliberate purpose to disregard blockade, and requesting that complaint may be made if there is any infringement of British neutrality act.	517
53 do	Aug. 1	J. D. Bullock's contract in Europe for ton iron steamers.	517
35	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Aug. 30	British government has disclaimed power to prevent departure of Bermuda.	518
85	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Sept. 10	If British government has power to prevent exportation of contraband, request that colonial authorities may prevent Mr. Adderly, of Nassau, New Providence, from carrying out contract for shipment of arms to insurgents.	518
86 do	Sept. 11	Inefficiency of British law to prevent exportation of contraband to insurgents will oblige United States to exercise vigilance in detecting unlawful character of British vessels approaching blockaded coast.	519
89 do	Sept. 14	Information of designs of insurgent emissaries in Great Britain enables authorities here to practice vigilance.	519
97 do	Sept. 25	Rapid increase of naval force will permit vigorous demonstrations on coast, which are expected to defeat the enterprises of the insurgents.	519
53	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Oct. 4	Incloses copies of two notes to Lord Russell in regard to violation of British neutrality in West India Islands. Consignment to Mr. Adderly, by insurgent order, arms and powder for confederacy.	520
136	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Nov. 30	Hospitalities extended to insurgent vessels in British ports which do not interfere with Queen's proclamation of neutrality, but which are denied by every other civilized State.	521
		1862.		
105	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Jan. 24	Revocation of orders prohibiting exportation of arms and ammunition of war. Refuge of insurgent privateers in British ports.	521
109	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	Jan. 27	Conversation with Mr. Thonvenot in regard to the settlement of the rights of neutrals on a liberal basis, and the continuance of the blockade on the southern coast.	522
182	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Feb. 13	British reasons for British of neutrality and attitude of British courts in permitting the Bermuda to be fitted out with arms and munitions to be employed by insurgents in their attempts to overthrow United States.	523
184 do	Feb. 14	Incloses communication from United States consul general at Havana in regard to the conduct of the master of the English steamer General Miramon.	524
	Mr. Seward to Lord Lyons.	Feb. 21	Opinion of the President in regard to the difference of Lord Russell from some of the conclusions presented in the note of the 26th of December upon the Trent affair.	524

GENERAL SUBJECT OF ENFORCEMENT OF NEUTRALITY—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
131	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	1862. Mar. 13	Incloses his note to Lord Russell in regard to the conduct of the master of the General Miramon, and showing that outside rebel lines nearly all the active sympathy and assistance came from subjects of Great Britain. Lord Russell's reply is also inclosed.	525
135 do	Mar. 27	In regard to the activity of British subjects to set aside the blockade, and arming vessels to engage in insurgent service. Does not consider it a proper time for a pressure for retraction of proclamation according belligerent rights to insurgents. Incloses copy of note to Lord Russell in regard to the preparation of the Oreto for the insurgent service, and to British encouragement of their cause.	529
140 do	April 3	Still adheres to opinion that proper time for application for revocation of proclamation according belligerent rights to insurgents has not arrived. Incloses Lord Russell's note on the gunboat Oreto, and the agency of British subjects in supplying aid to the rebels.	532
225	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	April 4	In regard to the fitting out of vessels of war in England for service of insurgents. Report that Captain Bullock will bring two iron-clads from England for insurgent service.	533
238 do	April 26	Regrets that British government will not arrest proceedings of parties engaged in supplying insurgents with material of war.	534
164	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	May 22	Incloses Lord Russell's note in reply to his application for revocation of proclamation according belligerent rights to insurgents, and relates substance of subsequent interview on same subject.	535
266	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	June 2	The revelation of insurgent military condition, and of their abuse of European neutrality, afforded by the appended report of Caleb Huse.	537
187	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	July 17	Inclosing correspondence with Lord Russell in regard to United States vessel Tuscarora, lying in Southampton for repairs.	540
323	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Aug. 13	Approves action in case of Oreto, and in regard to perversion of neutral privileges of Island of Nassau. Without English sympathy insurrection would die. British hostility towards United States can only be accounted for on ground of unnecessary jealousy.	541
	Mr. Stuart to Earl Russell.	Aug. 16	Has received from Mr. Seward assurance that the issue of letters of marque is for the present suspended.	542
336	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Sept. 8	Rumors in regard to the preparation of a navy for insurgents in British waters. Construction of navy in the United States to counteract its influence.	542
340 do	Sept. 13	Incloses intercepted letter addressed by S. R. Mallory, confederate secretary of navy, to James H. North, in regard to Oreto, Ala-	543

GENERAL SUBJECT OF ENFORCEMENT OF NEUTRALITY—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
		1862.		
237	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Oct. 10	bama, and the Florida, fitted out in England for the insurgents. Requests its communication to Lord Russell.	543
242do	Oct. 16	Mr. Gladstone's betrayal of his consciousness of the existence of plan for preparation of insurgent navy in England. Importance of the acknowledgment in connection with the position of Great Britain.	544 ✓
244do	Oct. 23	There is no disposition in England to apply powers of government to investigation of circumstances complained of in relation to the vessel 290.	544
378	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Oct. 25	Incloses Lord Russell's note of October 16th admitting that though foreign enlistment act or any other act can be evaded by subtle contrivances, the English government cannot go beyond letter of existing law.	545
427do	Dec. 15	Approves Mr. Adams's protest addressed to Lord Russell on subject of fitting out insurgent vessels in British ports.	545
435do	Dec. 29	Incloses copy of official correspondence relative to bark Maury, vessel supposed by Mr. Crampton to be intended to cruise against British commerce during Crimean war.	546
454do	1863. Jan. 19	Reasons for continued ill feeling in America against Great Britain.	546
462do	Jan. 30	Incloses copies of intercepted treasonable correspondence of insurgents at Richmond with their agents abroad in regard to insurgent naval preparations in Great Britain, and exhibiting condition of their affairs and intrigues in Europe.	561
322	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Feb. 13	Incloses communication from Secretary of Navy in regard to transmission by British and Spanish vessels of war of insurgent gold through blockaded ports of South to insurgent emissaries in England.	562
	Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.	Feb. 12	Incloses note to Lord Russell transmitting intercepted correspondence between insurgent officials in the United States and insurgent emissaries in Europe in regard to utilization of English neutrality; to arrangements for establishing the credit of the confederacy by the negotiation in English market of a loan to be paid by cotton consigned to commercial house in England and run through the blockade, and to incipient intrigue fostered by France for the establishment of Texan independence.	576
506	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Mar. 9	Acknowledges receipt of intercepted correspondence of confederate State, Treasury, and Navy departments, communicated by Mr. Adams.	576
			The destruction of the Jacob Bell by the Florida is regarded as indicating ruin of national navigation, unless it can be prevented either by enforcement of British neutrality or by the employment of force under commission of marque and reprisal.	

GENERAL SUBJECT OF ENFORCEMENT OF NEUTRALITY—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
349	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	1863. Mar. 13	Incloses note from Lord Russell, stating that the British government do not find any sufficient evidence in intercepted insurgent correspondence submitted, of system of action in direct hostility to United States on part of English subjects.	577
352do.....	Mar. 19	Incloses note to Lord Russell in regard to the allegation that the evidence contained in intercepted correspondence is incomplete as to active hostility of British subjects towards United States. Refers to the unfriendly interpretation to be placed upon the presence of an established agent in Great Britain for the construction of six iron-clad steamers, to be used in warring upon United States, and presence of financial agent to negotiate loans to sustain credit of insurgents.	579
356do.....	Mar. 27	Conversation with Earl Russell in regard to disposition and ability of the British government to prevent insurgents from using English territory as base for development of their plots. Lord Russell regrets the departure of the two privateers from British waters as a misfortune rather than a fault. Mr. Adams has communicated resolutions of Congress in regard to intervention, and suggests the prosecution of the parties in Liverpool known to have been connected with outfit of gunboats.	580
	Earl Russell to Lord Lyons.	Mar. 27	In regard to conversation with Mr. Adams upon the departure of the Oreto and Alabama from British ports, and the general subject of alleged insurgent violation of British neutrality.	584
359	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Mar. 28	Debate in House of Commons in regard to American affairs.	586
538	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	April 2	President regrets that British government declines to interfere to arrest proceedings of British subjects who are violating Queen's neutrality within the exclusive jurisdiction of Great Britain. Instructs Mr. Adams to enforce enlistment laws through courts.	586
540do.....	April 7	Uneasiness in United States arising through toleration of hostile naval preparations in Great Britain, and pressure for letters of marque and reprisal to insure success of naval operations against insurgents.	587
297	Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.	April 9	Conversation with Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys, in which he inquires concerning American action in reference to letters of marque, and to the consideration of the subject in English Parliament.	587
369	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	April 9	Incloses correspondence with Lord Russell in regard to the intercepted insurgent dispatches, who states that the British government will endeavor to discover and obtain legal evidence of violation of the enlistment act, with a view to its strict enforcement.	589

ENFORCEMENT OF NEUTRALITY.

LI

GENERAL SUBJECT OF ENFORCEMENT OF NEUTRALITY—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
370	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	1863. April 9	Incloses correspondence with Lord Russell in regard to the preparation at Liverpool of vessels for carrying on hostilities at sea against the United States.	593
545	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	April 10	Authorizes him to arrest, by judicial proceedings, the departure of hostile vessels from ports of Great Britain. The negotiation of insurgent loan in London is regarded by people of United States as tending to complicate relations between the two countries, so as to render it difficult to preserve friendship between them.	593
546do.....	April 10	In regard to the proper time for remonstrating against seeming toleration by British government of hostilities of its subjects against United States.	595
548do.....	April 13	Acknowledges receipt of dispatches, and says United States, under difficulties, unable in a friendly country to put into activity laws and proclamations designed to prevent aggressions by British subjects upon American commerce, appeal to England to enforce those laws. England avows her willingness to enforce laws, provided she is furnished with evidence that would lead to conviction of offenders.	595
552do.....	April 15	Incloses telegram from San Francisco collector of customs, relative to insurgent conspiracies in Vancouver.	596
386	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	April 23	Incloses note from Lord Russell, denying application of quotations from United States judicial decisions to occurrences in British dominion.	597
566	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	April 24	Approving his correspondence with Lord Russell concerning intercepted insurgent dispatches.	597
336	Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.	April 24	Intentions of President in regard to the issue of letters of marque, and his opinion of French neutrality.	597
400	Mr. Adams to Mr. Mr. Seward.	May 1	Incloses note to Lord Russell, stating that negotiation of insurgent cotton loan in London will terminate concessions of every form that have been made to alleviate rigors of blockade in regard to shipment of cotton.	598
409do.....	May 8	Incloses Lord Russell's reply to note in regard to effect of cotton loan in conduct of United States as to amelioration of the blockade.	599
588	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	May 9	United States will not fail to do justice to good disposition, which British government is manifesting to repress equipment of hostile vessels in British ports.	600
590do.....	May 9	Approving correspondence in regard to intercepted insurgent dispatches.	600
	Lampert & Holt and others to Earl Russell.	June 9	Memorial from ship-owners of Liverpool to the British secretary of state for foreign affairs, requesting, in view of the situation which permits a foreign belligerent to send to sea from British ports vessels of war in contravention of the provisions of existing law, an amendment to the foreign enlistment act.	601

GENERAL SUBJECT OF ENFORCEMENT OF NEUTRALITY—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
		1863.		
	E. Hammond to Lamport and Holt, and others.	July 6	States that, in opinion of Lord Russell, foreign enlistment act is effectual for all reasonable purposes.	602
663	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	July 24	It is hoped, in view of some changes in military situation of United States, that British government will not be indifferent to transactions tending so strongly towards alienation and war.	602
480	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Aug. 21	Incloses correspondence with Lord Russell in regard to the prohibition against repacking gunpowder at Belize, British Honduras, enforced by Governor Seymour.	603
689	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Sept. 2	Requests that thanks be communicated to Rear Admiral Sir Lewis T. Jones for his efforts to prevent embarkation of rebel crew and officers on vessel supposed to have been "Southerner," at Queenstown.	604
691.do.....	Sept. 2	Reviews menacing character of European situation towards United States, and requesting Mr. Adams to ascertain whether there is any evidences of disposition in British governing circles to maintain amicable and cordial relations with the United States.	604
499	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Sept. 17	Incloses reply of Lord Russell in regard to the communication of thanks to Governor Seymour of Honduras.	605
740	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Oct. 24	Probable effect of Lord Russell's speech at Blairgowrie on opinion in the United States. Review of instances which cause irritation between United States and England.	606
756do.....	Nov. 9	If Great Britain shall cease to permit the issue of insurgent privateers from her ports, and shall revoke her recognition of insurgent belligerency, United States will endeavor to countervail among its citizens the effect of British hostile declamation; but United States are not disposed to submit to what they have declared would be intolerable injuries from any foreign power.	607
761do.....	Nov. 16	Incloses correspondence of Mr. Marcy in regard to the expectations of England and France concerning the equipment of privateers in the United States.	607
		1864.		
586	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Jan. 28	Reply to Lord Russell in regard to the naturalization on insurgent vessels at sea of British subjects as confederate citizens.	608
606do.....	Mar. 3	In regard to the alleged improper voyage of the Will-o'-the-wisp.	608
802	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Jan. 6	Case of the Rappahannock, and the general subject of insurgent violation of British neutrality and the modes of prevention adopted by British government.	609
917do.....	April 22	Announces proceedings inspired by dismissal by law lords of appeal in case of Alexandra. Reviews situation at home and abroad.	610

GENERAL SUBJECT OF ENFORCEMENT OF NEUTRALITY—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
919	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	1864. April 23	President expects Mr. Adams to remonstrate with Lord Russell upon organization of a joint stock company to carry supplies from British ports to the insurgents, under contract with insurgent cabal at Richmond.	612
684	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	May 12	Trial of iron-clads is postponed, on application of Mr. Bravay, until 6th of June. Part of crew of ship Avon have been landed at Plymouth. Florida at St. Nazaire. Concentration of insurgent naval force in England.	612
1018	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	July 2	Requests Mr. Adams to communicate to Lord Russell that the whole of the British West India Islands are practically used by insurgents as base for hostile operations. Complaint of Great Britain that United States vessels have violated neutrality regulations of British government in Bahama Islands.	613
664	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	1865. Jan. 12	Incloses letter in London Times, by Historicus, in regard to the operations of insurgents in English territory, and the application of international law to their captures at sea.	613
1256	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Jan. 30	The letter of Historicus and the claim of the insurgents to unusual interpretation of international law in favor of their captures at sea. Incloses dispatches of Mr. Slidell to Mr. Benjamin in regard to negotiation with English and French governments to assent to their wishes concerning captures at sea of neutral property.	614
	J. P. Benjamin's instructions to insurgent cruisers.	1864. Published in Index of Dec. 29, 1864.	Rebel minute of instruction relative to their cruisers.	621
877	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	1865. Feb. 15	Important friendly communication from Lord Russell will come in next mail.	625
	Earl Russell to Mr. Burnley.	Feb. 15	Informa Mr. Burnley that he trusts that orders sent to governor general in Canada will convince United States that everything that can will be done to prevent carrying on hostilities against United States from Canadian territory or waters, and that he has addressed a letter to the confederate government on the subject of their use of British soil as base for hostile expeditions against United States.	625
879	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Feb. 16	Incloses correspondence with Lord Russell in regard to responsibility for outfits by individuals of vessels for account of rebels. Has received from him assurances of friendly action of Canadian government, and a letter which is to be delivered to insurgent government, reviewing the conduct of their agents, and requesting them to desist from using British soil as base for hostile operations. Mr. Adams is convinced that nothing but grossest misman-	626

GENERAL SUBJECT OF ENFORCEMENT OF NEUTRALITY—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
		1865.	agement on part of United States would effect any change in established policy of Great Britain towards United States. Popular apprehensions of what is to follow conquest of insurgents by United States.	
	Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.	Feb. 15	Inclosing his letter to Messrs. Mason, Slidell, and Mann, referred to in previous dispatch No. 879, as one to be delivered to insurgent government.	630
	Earl Russell to Mason, Slidell, and Mann.	Feb. 13	Complaints of the violation of British neutrality by insurgent government. (Inclosed with Mr. Adams's 879.)	630
884	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Feb. 23	Conversation with Lord Russell in regard to proposition of rebels to make, upon quarter-deck of their privateers, a prize court to adjudicate prizes and neutral property. If England and France assent to this proposition, United States will claim similar rights in regard to neutral property.	632
1282	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Mar. 1	Policy of President is not one of conquest or retaliation. Relations between England and United States are not improved by conduct of Great Britain in permitting insurgent schemes to find development on British soil. Incloses telegram from United States consul at Halifax, in regard to iron-clad fleet under Captain Moffat, from French and English ports, to attack New York; proceedings indicated, which, if adopted by Great Britain, would be generous and just.	633
1294do	Mar. 9	In regard to Mr. Adams's conversation with Lord Russell relative to aggressions coming from British provinces and ports, and to the transmission of British official copy of note addressed to Messrs. Slidell, Mason, and Mann, to General Lee, commanding insurgent forces. Incloses copy of letter to Secretary of War upon the subject.	635
1311do	Mar. 20	Incloses correspondence with War Department in regard to transmission of British letter to Messrs. Slidell, Mason, and Mann through military lines.	637
903	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Mar. 23	Incloses correspondence with Lord Russell in regard to the termination of the Canadian reciprocity treaty.	638
1325	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Mar. 27	Incloses correspondence with War Department in regard to refusal of General Lee to receive copy of communication addressed by British government to Messrs. Mason, Slidell, and Mann.	639
916	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	April 6	Lord Russell is too unwell to grant interview; has left dispatches 1294, 1309, 1311, and 1315 with him.	641
922do	April 12	Conversation with Lord Russell in regard to outfits and other operations of the rebels; has sent notice to Mr. Perry, at Madrid, concerning J. P. Hall and the steamer Kearsarge.	641

ENFORCEMENT OF NEUTRALITY.

LV

GENERAL SUBJECT OF ENFORCEMENT OF NEUTRALITY—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
931	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	1865. April 20	Incloses correspondence with Lord Russell in regard to refusal of insurgent General Lee to receive copy of communication addressed to Messrs. Mason, Slidell, and Mann.	642
938do.....	April 28	Incloses Lord Russell's note in regard to the investigation of the character of two vessels, the Virginia and Louisa Ann Fanny, at the Bermudas.	643
1520	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Aug. 22.	Incloses correspondence between Sir Frederick Bruce and State Department, in regard to the withdrawal of the notice abrogating the agreement contained in the convention of 1817, limiting the naval armament on the lakes.	644
1137	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	1866. Jan. 25	Incloses circular from Lord Clarendon requesting information concerning the construction of vessels for foreign governments in the private ship-yards of England, and his acknowledgment thereof.	647
1687	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Feb. 17	Incloses letter from Secretary of Navy stating that United States has had no vessel building within British dominions since 1861.	648
60	Mr. Dudley to Mr. Seward.	1862. May 3	In regard to the purchase of thirty steamers in England, for the purpose of making combined attack upon United States. The Semaphore and Memphis are among the number.	648
61do.....	May 7	Has communicated information concerning purchase of thirty steamers, to Mr. Adams and to Mr. Morse. Gives list of those that have sailed, and those that are building in England.	649
164do.....	Nov. 21	England is main dependence of rebels for arms, ammunition, and all kinds of clothing for their army. Gives list and locations of blockade runners.	650
185do.....	Dec. 30	Detailed information concerning Laird's rams, other steamers, the Glasgow ram, the steamer at Stockton, Miller's gunboat, and two at London.	651
131do.....	1863. Aug. 15	Is persuaded that if it had not been for the aid and assistance the insurgents received from England, rebellion would not have assumed its present proportions.	654
135do.....	Aug. 24	Description of vessels building for insurgents in Thomson's yard, at Glasgow. Insurgent credit in England based upon their cotton; policy of destroying it recommended. Vessels building and afloat for use of insurgents.	654
224do.....	1864. Feb. 5	Petition of Liverpool merchants, asking British government to recognize southern confederacy. Incloses slip relating doings of Alabama.	657
206do.....	June 15	Incloses instructions to governors of colonies in regard to belligerent cruisers and their prizes.	657

AMENDMENT OF LAWS.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
377	Mr. Dudley to Mr. Seward.	1864. Nov. 4	In regard to indisposition of English government to prevent sailing of insurgent vessels from Liverpool. Insurgents in future will probably purchase vessels that are already built, and send them out with armament stored as merchandise. Probable course of Leon Smith.	658

AMENDMENT OF LAWS.

83	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	1861. Sept. 7	Refers to the passage of a law in 1838, by United States, which prevented intervention against government of Great Britain by American citizens, and submits propriety of adoption of similar measure in Great Britain at present juncture.	659
85do	Sept. 10	Incloses intercepted letter from John P. Baldwin to Henry Adderly, relative to shipment of arms and powder for the use of the insurgents, from Nassau. The United States expect special legislation by British government to cover such cases, of the character of the act of Congress of 1838.	660
79	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Nov. 29	Incloses Lord Russell's note stating that if necessary to preserve neutrality, her Majesty will be advised to adopt further measures.	660
160do	1863. May 15	Incloses correspondence with Lord Russell in regard to escape of the Emily St. Pierre, through absence of legal authority of British government to punish her offense. Interpretation of Queen's neutrality proclamation induces United States to believe that such authority exists in British statute. Earl Russell replies that blockade runners, laden with contraband, do not come within the province of foreign enlistment act, and that it devolves upon the United States to capture them. Mr. Adams's rejoinder on same subject.	661
	Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.	June 12	Offenses which are within provisions of foreign enlistment act.	665
381	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Oct. 25	Incloses papers from minister at Lisbon, in regard to depredations of insurgent vessels dispatched from British ports, upon American commerce, near island of Flores.	665
383do	Oct. 27	Incloses resolutions of chamber of commerce in regard to destruction at sea of American vessels, near Azores, by insurgents.	665
	Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.	Nov. 20	Solicits redress for national and private injury sustained by United States and more effective prevention of repetition of such lawless proceedings in English ports.	666
281	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Dec. 25	Incloses Lord Russell's note of 19th, suggesting amendment to foreign enlistment	666

AMENDMENT OF LAWS—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
		1863.		
454	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Jan. 19	act of both countries with a view to an increased efficiency. Directs conference with Lord Russell in regard to suggested amendments to enlistment acts of both countries. Incloses intercepted treasonable correspondence, and directs him to employ them so as to induce British government to enforce existing laws.	667
391	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Feb. 13	Lord Russell states that lord chancellor having considered that their foreign enlistment act was sufficiently effective, no change it seemed could be made.	668
	Earl Russell to Lord Lyons.	Feb. 14	Mr. Adams has said that he was ready to hear any amendments to United States foreign enlistment act, but they considered it already satisfactory. As British cabinet has come to similar conclusion in regard to English law no further proceedings at present need be taken.	668
483	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Feb. 19	President hopes that British government will act upon Lord Russell's suggestion as to amendment of the foreign enlistment acts of the two countries.	669
493do.....	Mar. 2	As British government conclude that their foreign enlistment law is sufficient without amendments, the President expects that England will take measures to enforce execution of the law.	669
	Earl Russell to Lord Lyons.	Mar. 27	Lord Russell states that cabinet are of opinion that enlistment act is sufficient, but legal evidence could not always be procured; that British government had done everything in its power to execute the law.	670
651	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	July 11	President suggests for consideration of British government whether, on appeal made by them, Parliament might not think it expedient to amend existing statute so as to effect what is believed it ought to accomplish. If British law is not amended, the alternative of the United States.	670
453do.....	July 16	Calling attention to reply of Mr. Hammond to memorial of ship-owners of Liverpool suggesting alteration in foreign enlistment act.	671
	Memorial of ship owners of Liverpool to Earl Russell.	June 9	Suggesting an alteration in foreign enlistment act.	671
	Mr. Hammond to Messrs. Lamport and Holt and others.	July 6	Stating that in Lord Russell's opinion the enlistment act is effectual for all reasonable purposes. If provisions of act were extended, presence of proof would be necessary, because no law could or should be passed to punish upon suspicion.	673
493	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Sept. 10	Announcement of Lord Russell, in public speech, that how powers may be solicited from Parliament if present powers should prove insufficient.	673

AMENDMENT OF LAWS—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
	Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.	1863. Sept. 16	British government cannot justly plead inefficacy of enlistment law to enforce duties of neutrality in present emergency.	673
	Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.	Sept. 25	The intimation of hostile proceedings towards Great Britain by United States will not induce British cabinet either to overstep limits of the law, or propose to Parliament the adoption of any new law they may not think proper to be adopted.	674
	Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.	Sept. 29	Did not intimate hostile proceedings, but urged a reliance upon the law as sufficient, from the confidence expressed in it by the most eminent authority in the kingdom.	674
760	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Nov. 14	Communicates information concerning projected insurgent expeditions from Canada. Requests that Lord Russell may be asked to consider the plot in connection with threatened aggression directly from the ports of Liverpool and Glasgow. Principles which shall regulate maritime conduct of neutral states hereafter are likely to be settled by precedents which arise during present civil war.	675
552	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Dec. 10	Alludes to use made of Canadian territory by insurgents, and suggests to Lord Russell possibility of reciprocating legislation of United States in 1838. Has left printed copy of law with Lord Russell.	676
1136	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	1864. Oct. 24	Requesting serious attention of British government to the multiplying instances of insurgent use of Canadian territory as base for hostile expeditions. Motives of insurgents. Declination of reasonable request of United States in regard to improvement of British law.	676
1042	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	1865. Sept. 7	Incloses Lord Russell's note of the 30th August in regard to the adoption of a new law when the inadequacy of an old law is apparent. The existing law has not proved inadequate in cases of rains in the Mersey or Pampero in the Clyde.	677
1052do.	Sept. 21	Incloses note to Lord Russell of the 18th of September, replying to Lord Russell's defence of existing British legislation as having proved adequate to preserve neutrality. Reviews Lord Russell's account of adoption of neutrality laws in United States and England.	678
	Earl of Clarendon to Sir F. Bruce.	Dec. 26	Conversation with Mr. Adams in regard to propriety of amendment of international law where it had been demonstrated to be necessary, and requesting that Mr. Seward may be invited to co-operate to that end.	680
1127	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	1866. Jan. 4	Incloses note to the earl of Clarendon, communicating declination by United States of British proposition for revision of English and American neutrality laws so that security might be given against those who evade them.	681

ENFORCEMENT OF NEUTRALITY.

LIX

SUPPLIES, ETC., OF VESSELS—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
		1866.		
	Earl of Clarendon to Mr. Adams.	Jan. 4	Acknowledging Mr. Adams's note informing British government that United States is not inclined to assent to concurrent revision of neutrality statutes.	682
1161	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Mar. 1	Incloses his note to Earl of Clarendon in regard to statement of Sir Roundell Palmer, in House of Commons, that failure of British cabinet to improve their preventive laws was undoubtedly owing to the action of the United States.	682
1164do.....	Mar. 8	Incloses debate in Parliament on questions of maritime law, and correction by Sir Roundell Palmer of his statement that failure of British cabinet to improve British law was owing to action of United States.	686
1168do.....	Mar. 15	Incloses correspondence between himself and Earl of Clarendon in regard to Sir Roundell Palmer's statement, on the 23d of February, in the House of Commons.	687
1712	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Mar. 20	Approval of his correction of the statement of Sir Roundell Palmer.	692
	Mr. Moran to Mr. Seward.	Mar. 29	Incloses Lord Clarendon's note of the 24th instant, and its accompaniment from Sir Roundell Palmer relative to statements made lately in House of Commons in regard to amendment of foreign enlistment acts of Great Britain and United States.	693
8do.....	Oct. 13	Announcement in the Standard that Lord Derby would appoint royal commission to inquire into workings of existing neutrality law.	694
		1868.		
42do.....	June 3	Communicates reports and comments of London papers thereon, of the royal commission appointed to inquire into character and working of foreign enlistment act.	695

SUPPLIES, ETC., OF VESSELS.

		1861.		
42	Mr. Whiting to Mr. Seward.	Dec. 10	Arrival of Isabel and Gladiator laden with arms for rebels. That coal of United States cannot be reshipped without violating neutrality laws of Great Britain.	696
43do.....	Dec. 10	Incloses letter from colonial secretary communicating governor's order that if United States coal is landed it shall be with understanding that it must not be reshipped.	696
44do.....	Dec. 12	Incloses letter of colonial secretary refusing to allow transhipment of coal from the Caleb Stetson to the United States steamer Flambeau, in Bahama waters.	697
46do.....	Dec. 19	Coaling of insurgent packet Theodora allowed after refusal of similar privilege to the Flambeau, United States steamer. Colonial secretary replies that Theodora is	698

SUPPLIES, ETC., OF VESSELS—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
		1862.	commercial vessel, and therefore entitled to hospitalites of port.	
1	Mr. Whiting to Mr. Seward.	Jan. 2	Has ordered coal fleet to Key West. British brig Cecil, Master Boggs, refuses to go. Movements of rebel steamer Isabel, and British steamer Gladiator.	699
172	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Jan. 31	Requesting Earl Russell to explain proceedings in case of Flambeau. United States steamer refused permission to coal at Nassau.	700
125	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Mar. 6	Incloses note to Earl Russell, soliciting such action as will rectify error of interdicting to United States steamer Flambeau the use of coal stored at Nassau.	700
		1863.		
	Mr. Seward to Lord Lyons.	April 4	The sale of the cargo of the prize ship Hanover, captured by the insurgent vessel Retribution at Long Cay, Bahamas, and the subsequent dispatch of the Hanover, laden with salt, to an insurgent port.	701
	Lord Lyons to Mr. Seward.	April 7	Acknowledges receipt of note in regard to the sale of the cargo of the insurgent prize Hanover, at Long Cay, Bahamas, and promises inquiry.	701
	Do	June 13	Incloses communication from governor of Bahamas, in regard to sale of cargo of insurgent prize Hanover, at Long Cay.	702
	Mr. Seward to Lord Lyons.	June 17	Acknowledges receipt of note of 13th instant relative to insurgent prize ship Hanover.	704
	Do	June 24	In relation to report of Mr. T. B. Burnside to governor of Bahamas. There is doubt in mind of government of United States whether the authorities at Long Cay were ignorant that the Hanover was a prize to the Retribution.	705
	Lord Lyons to Mr. Seward.	June 30	Will communicate his request for further prosecution concerning knowledge by British authorities of character of Hanover when at Long Cay, Bahamas.	705
	Do	Nov. 2	Incloses dispatch from governor of Bahamas reporting measures taken by attorney general of colony for prosecution of Vernon Locke, a man charged with having been concerned in the fraud practiced on the authorities at Long Cay in case of Hanover. Locke has given bail in £400.	705
	Mr. Seward to Lord Lyons.	Nov. 10	The bail in the case of Vernon Locke seems insignificant; but United States trusts that justice of British government will be vindicated.	706
		1865.		
1287	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Feb. 25	In regard to the refusal of British authorities at Nassau to permit United States vessel Hondurns to enter the port. Contrasts this exclusion with the permission accorded to blockade runners and suspicious craft of insurgent origin to remain at anchor in harbor, and that these proceedings, associated with insurgent operations in Canada, will make incurable breach between England and United States.	707

BLOCKADE-RUNNING.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
926	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	1865. April 13	Incloses correspondence with Lord Russell in regard to the refusal of the authorities at Nassau to permit the entry of United States steamer Honduras, and to the presence of the Rattlesnake, Tallahassee, suspicious craft, in the same harbor and at the same time.	708
1366	Mr. Hunter to Mr. Adams.	April 24	Incloses letter of Secretary of Navy in regard to proceedings of the governor of the Bahamas in refusing to allow United States vessel of war to enter port of Abaco for purpose of removing property saved from wreck of United States steamer San Jacinto, and calling attention to want of comity exhibited by governor on that occasion.	718

BLOCKADE-RUNNING.

	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	1861. Nov. 1	Success of Bermuda has tempted insurgent agents to prosecution of enterprises to run blockade. Movement of arms from Hamburg, and the occupation of Birmingham and London in turning out rifles for shipment through the blockade. Presence of Semmes in England, and his purposes.	719
128do.....	1862. Mar. 7	Projects of insurgents, and schemes to run the blockade. Departures of the Bermuda and the Oreto. Wants official intelligence of the captures of blockade runners.	719
207	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Mar. 11	The insurance by English companies in Liverpool of blockade runners is by implication levying war on United States. It is inconsistent with relations of friendship, and will excite in this country feelings of deep alienation.	720
132	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Mar. 20	Review of British sentiment on American question. Conflict of Great Britain with United States would transfer whole carrying trade of Great Britain into hands of neutral continental nations. It is plain that without additional provision, suggested by Mr. Marcy, English interests on the sea are in great jeopardy in time of war, and yet with admission of it control of the ocean is forever lost. Self interest being point of their policy, the adoption of declaration of Paris is a sacrifice of which they are beginning to repent. The way to make any real advance in doctrines of international law is to enforce observation of a consistent system of policy upon any single power, whenever it may venture to set up its immediate interest as only rule of action it will abide by.	720
156do.....	May 8	Incloses Lord Russell's note of May 6, in the case of the steamer Labuan, stating that if United States inflicts the great injury	722

BLOCKADE-RUNNING.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
		1862.	of a blockade upon other nations, the utmost they can expect is, that European powers shall respect those acts of United States within limits of law. Mr. Adams replies that United States is embarrassed by complaints of severity of blockade by a friendly nation, which at same time confesses its inability to restrain its subjects from stimulating the resistance that necessitates continuance of the blockade. He is pained to learn that United States cannot expect that England should frame new statutes to remedy deficiency of its laws to prevent what it acknowledges on face of old statute to be evils created by its refractory subjects. Has a list of eleven steamers and ten sailing vessels to run the blockade via Nassau, and that business is reduced to a system, aided by British capital.	
281	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	June 26	The use of Nassau by insurgents as place of deposit of their munitions of war shipped thither from England. Release of insurgent vessel Oroto on arrival of Captain Semmes, of Sumter. Request that protest against proceeding may be made to British government.	725
205	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Aug. 7	Incloses note from Lord Russell, covering a letter from Mr. Layard to Mr. Hersfall, suggesting, in reply to a memorial from British merchants and ship-owners in Liverpool in regard to proceedings of United States cruisers off Bahamas, that Liverpool merchants should refrain from blockade running.	726
205do.....	Nov. 27	Outfits of vessels to run the blockade multiply. Arrival of Captain Maury and eight or nine rebel officers indicates that something warlike is to be expected.	728
		1863.		
286do.....	Jan. 1	Incloses note of 30th December to Lord Russell, in regard to British equipment of blockade runners, enlistment of British subjects in insurgent service, the occupation of Nassau as storehouse for goods awaiting transshipment to insurgent territory, the insurance of blockade runners, and the arming of insurgent vessels-of-war. Accompanies his note by list of vessels engaged in illegal commerce, from Messrs. Dudley and Morse.	728
1	Mr. Dudley to Mr. Seward.	Jan. 2	List and description of blockade runners; their rendezvous; and the foreign ports en route to insurgent ports where stores are kept, awaiting opportunity to be run through blockade.	732
136do.....	Aug. 25	Incloses slip from Journal of Commerce, stating that confederates receive immense supplies by way of Wilmington, and that officers and crew are leaving to man insurgent vessels building in England.	733
736	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Oct. 17	Incloses letter from Secretary of Navy in regard to contract between insurgent agents for delivery of naval stores at St. George's,	734

BLOCKADE-RUNNING—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
		1863.	Bermuda, to be thence introduced into United States. Requests that Bermuda authorities may prevent the islands becoming place of deposit in violation of Queen's neutrality.	
529	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Nov. 4	Incloses note to Lord Russell in regard to intercepted contract between insurgents concerning delivery of naval stores at St. George's, Bermuda.	735
550do.....	Dec. 4	Incloses reply of Lord Russell in regard to intercepted insurgent contract concerning delivery of naval stores at St. George's, Bermuda.	737
782	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Dec. 7	Requests inquiry whether Ralph Cator, <i>alias</i> Peterson, a blockade runner, is either an active or retired British naval officer.	738
		1864.		
566	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Jan. 1	Incloses note to Earl Russell in relation to the conduct of Ralph Cator, <i>alias</i> Peterson, and Lord Russell's acknowledgment.	739
570do.....	Jan. 8	Incloses note from Lord Russell, in regard to employment of Ralph Cator, commander in British navy, in running blockade.	740
806	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Jan. 11	Incloses letters which show that British vessels engaged in violations of blockade are not neutral vessels, but rebel transports dispatched and sailing under British flag. He will inquire of Earl Russell, in view of this development, if that English policy needs modification.	741
810do.....	Jan. 12	While he admits that evidence in case of the use of Bermuda as insurgent depot is attended by uncertainty and want of directness, it is thought that England could institute precautionary measures against execution of insurgent purpose in the island so injurious to United States. Of the same class of cases does the news contained in the Morning Telegraph of St. Johns, New Brunswick, relate, and the conveyance of contraband mail to Bermuda by Lieutenant Rooke, of the British army.	741
812do.....	Jan. 13	Incloses extract from London Index in regard to the employment of the British flag to cover property of insurgent authorities who, in many instances, own the vessels flying that flag.	742
814	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Jan. 14	Incloses extract from dispatch of United States consul at Malta, relative to reports that British naval officers, under assumed names, are engaged in violating blockade.	744
584	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Jan. 28	Enlarges in interview with Lord Russell upon aggravated nature of violations audaciously committed by rebels against neutrality of Great Britain, and urges expediency of more positive action in advance of settlement of difficulties in America. Lord Russell states that cabinet has disapproved his suggestion to send armed vessel to confederate authorities with an officer instructed to remonstrate.	744
	Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.	Jan. 25	In regard to the employment of the British flag to cover insurgent ownership of block-	745

BLOCKADE-RUNNING—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
		1864.		
590	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Feb. 4	ade runners and the engagement of Lieutenant Rooke, of British army, in carrying contraband mail to Bermuda. The difficulties which grow out of the toleration of the outrageous abuses of belligerent privileges granted to the insurgents. Incloses papers found on steamers taken in violating blockade.	748
631do.	Mar. 18	Incloses Lord Russell's acknowledgment of Mr. Adams's note covering papers taken in steamers engaged in running the blockade of the southern ports.	749
901	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	April 5	Incloses correspondence with Lord Russell in regard to habitual abuse by insurgents of the belligerent privileges conceded to them by United States, and the consequent suspicion attaching to British subjects engaged in violating blockade. To the treatment as prisoners of war of British subjects found on board vessels ostensibly British, but really property of insurgents. To the charge against Lieutenant Rooke, of British army, of carrying contraband mail, and to the intentions of James Ash, and Stringer, Pembroke & Co., to build steamers for confederate belligerents.	753
647	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	April 8	States that Secretary of Navy has concluded to direct discharge of aliens captured on neutral vessels violating blockade.	754
663do.	April 21	Incloses acknowledgment of Earl Russell of note in relation to fraudulent use by rebels of British flag to cover their vessels and crew in running blockade.	754
728do.	June 23	Correspondence with Lord Russell in regard to what appears to admit of no doubt, that every vessel engaged in blockade-running must consent to be at the service of the enemy to aid him in carrying on the war. Statement of attorney general of liability of certain persons to prosecution under the enlistment act.	757
1026	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	July 9	Renewal of correspondence with Lord Russell in regard to liability of British subjects captured in blockade runners to be treated by United States as enemies. Acknowledging correspondence with Lord Russell in regard to British claim to immunity for British subjects who engage in furnishing supplies of arms to insurgents in vessels owned or chartered by insurgent authorities who run the blockade under contract with them.	758

BLOCKADE RUNNING—THE BERMUDA.

31	Mr. Wilding to Mr. F. W. Seward.	1861. Aug. 16	Description of Bermuda, a screw steamer built by Fraser, Trenholm & Co.	759
27	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Aug. 16	Incloses note to Lord Russell in regard to equipment in English waters of steamer	759

ENFORCEMENT OF NEUTRALITY.

LXV

BLOCKADE-RUNNING—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
		1861.		
30	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	Aug. 23	Bermuda to be employed in insurgent service, and Lord Russell's acknowledgment. Bermuda has sailed, laden with gunpowder and stores. Incloses Lord Russell's note stating that there is not sufficient evidence to warrant interference with clearance or sailing of Bermuda.	761
35do.....	Aug. 30	All he can do is to apprise department in season so as to prevent supplies shipped, as on Bermuda, from reaching United States. Purchase of steamers Leopold, Princess Charlotte, and Southampton.	762
38do.....	Sept. 6	In regard to complicity of Fraser, Trenholm & Co. with departure of steamer Bermuda.	763
86	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Sept. 11	Regrets inefficiency of British laws to prevent violations of United States rights. The vigilance that will of necessity be exercised in detecting unlawful character of British vessels will be unpleasant to British government.	763
	Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.	Nov. 22	Informing Lord Russell of the arrival of the steamer Bermuda at the insurgent port of Savannah, and reflections thereon.	763
		1862.		
16	Mr. Dudley to Mr. Seward.	Feb. 14	In regard to contraband cargo of steamer Bermuda.	764
17do.....	Feb. 15	In regard to insurgent ownership of Bermuda.	765
276	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	June 23	Inclodes printed copy of record in case of United States vs. Prize steamer Bermuda and cargo.	765
278do.....	June 25	Inclodes Mr. Ashton's communication calling attention to unsigned letter to be found in record of United States vs. Bermuda.	766

BLOCKADE-RUNNING—THE FINGAL.

59	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	1861. Oct. 17	Sailing of Fingal with bark Amelia, laden with cartridges and gunpowder. Information concerning her movements.	768
634	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	1863. June 22	In regard to capture of Fingal near Savannah by United States cruisers.	768

BLOCKADE-RUNNING—THE GLADIATOR.

69	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	1861. Nov. 8	Equipment of the Gladiator at London.....	769
44	Mr. Whiting to Mr. Seward.	Dec. 12	In regard to arrival of Gladiator at Nassau. Colonial secretary's letter upon subject is inclosed.	769
	Do.....	1862. Jan. 19.	Movement of rebel vessels Caroline <i>alias</i> Kate Lockwood, Isabel <i>alias</i> Ella Warley, and Gladiator, in harbor and near Nassau.	770

BLOCKADE-RUNNING—Continued.

No.	From whom and to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
10	Mr. Whiting to Mr. Seward.	1862. Feb. 12	Movement of rebel vessels and arrival of Catawba at Nassau direct from Charleston.	771
101	Mr. Dudley to Mr. Seward.	Aug. 1	Sailing of Gladiator from Liverpool.....	771
105do.....	Aug. 8	Movement of Gladiator; her cargo.....	772

BLOCKADE-RUNNING—THE GEORGIANA.

301	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	1863. Jan. 22	Incloses correspondence with Lord Russell remonstrating against departure of Georgiana from Liverpool, and letter from Mr. Morse, consul at London, describing vessel, and correspondence between British authorities on same subject.	772
311do.....	Jan. 29	Incloses further correspondence with Lord Russell in regard to steamer Georgiana.	777
531	Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.	Mar. 28	Incloses communication from Mr. Whiting in regard to arrival of Georgiana at Nassau, with request that it may be laid before Earl Russell.	782
368	Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.	April 9	Is glad to learn that Georgiana has been driven ashore.	782
374do.....	April 16	Incloses note to Lord Russell in regard to arrival of Georgiana at Nassau, covering communication from Mr. Whiting, United States consul at Nassau, and Lord Russell's acknowledgment thereof.	783

Enforcement of neutrality continued in Volume II.

RECOGNITION OF REBEL BELLIGERENCY.

CLAIMS AGAINST GREAT BRITAIN.

RECOGNITION OF REBEL BELLIGERENCY BY GREAT BRITAIN AND FRANCE.

Mr. Black to Mr. Dallas.

[Circular.]

No. 304.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 28, 1861.

SIR: You are, of course, aware that the election of last November resulted in the choice of Mr. Abraham Lincoln; that he was the candidate of the republican or anti-slavery party; that the preceding discussion had been confined almost entirely to topics connected, directly or indirectly, with the subject of negro slavery; that every northern State cast its whole electoral vote (except three in New Jersey) for Mr. Lincoln, while in the whole South the popular sentiment against him was almost absolutely universal. Some of the southern States, immediately after the election, took measures for separating themselves from the Union, and others soon followed their example. Conventions have been called in South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas, and those conventions, in all except the last-named State, have passed ordinances declaring their secession from the federal government. A congress, composed of representatives from the six first-named States, has been assembled for some time at Montgomery, Alabama. By this body a provisional constitution has been framed for what it styles the "Confederated States of America."

It is not improbable that persons claiming to represent the States which have thus attempted to throw off their federal obligations will seek a recognition of their independence by the government of Great Britain. In the event of such an effort being made, you are expected by the President to use such means as may in your judgment be proper and necessary to prevent its success.

The reasons set forth in the President's message at the opening of the present session of Congress, in support of his opinion that the States have no constitutional power to secede from the Union, are still unanswered, and are believed to be unanswerable. The grounds upon which they have attempted to justify the revolutionary act of severing the bonds which connect them with their sister States are regarded as wholly insufficient. This government has not relinquished its constitutional jurisdiction within the territory of those States, and does not design to do so.

It must be very evident that it is the right of this government to ask of all foreign powers that the latter shall take no steps which may tend to encourage the revolutionary movement of the seceding States, or increase the danger of disaffection in those which still remain loyal. The President feels assured that the government of her Britannic Majesty will not do anything in these affairs inconsistent with the friendship which this government has always heretofore experienced from her and her

ancestors. If the independence of the "Confederated States" should be acknowledged by the great powers of Europe, it would tend to disturb the friendly relations, diplomatic and commercial, now existing between those powers and the United States. All these are consequences which the court of her Britannic Majesty will not fail to see are adverse to the interests of Great Britain as well as to those of this country.

Your familiar knowledge of our political institutions will enable you to explain satisfactorily the causes of our present domestic troubles, and the grounds of the hope still entertained that entire harmony will soon be restored.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

J. S. BLACK.

GEORGE M. DALLAS, Esq., *London, &c., &c., &c.*

The same, *mutatis mutandis*, to W. Preston, Esq., Madrid; E. G. Fair, Esq., Brussels; Theo. S. Fay, Esq., Berne; Jos. A. Wright, Esq., Berlin; J. G. Jones, Esq., Vienna; J. Williams, Esq., Constantinople; Charles J. Faulkner, Esq., Paris; Henry O. Murphy, Esq., Hague; John Appleton, Esq., St. Petersburg.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dallas.

CIRCULAR.

[Communicated to Lord Russell by Mr. Dallas, April 8—British Blue Book, No. 1 of 1862, p. 17.—Relating to the civil war in the United States.]

[Extracts.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 9, 1861.

SIR: My predecessor, in his dispatch No. 304 addressed to you on the 28th of February last, instructed you to use all proper and necessary measures to prevent the success of efforts which may be made by persons claiming to represent those States of this Union in whose name a provisional government has been announced to procure a recognition of their independence by the government of Great Britain.

I am now instructed by the President of the United States to inform you that, having assumed the administration of the government in pursuance of an unquestioned election and of the directions of the Constitution, he renews the injunction which I have mentioned, and relies upon the exercise of the greatest possible diligence and fidelity on your part to counteract and prevent the designs of those who would invoke foreign intervention to embarrass or overthrow the republic.

When you reflect on the novelty of such designs, their unpatriotic and revolutionary character, and the long train of evils which must follow directly or consequentially from even their partial or temporary success, the President feels assured that you will justly appreciate and cordially approve the caution which prompts this communication.

I transmit herewith a copy of the address pronounced by the President on taking the constitutional oath of office. It sets forth clearly the errors of the misguided partisans who are seeking to dismember the Union, the grounds on which the conduct of those partisans is disallowed, and also the general policy which the government will pursue with a view to the preservation of domestic peace and order, and the maintenance and preservation of the federal Union.

You will lose no time in submitting this address to the British minister for foreign affairs, and in assuring him that the President of the United States entertains a full confidence in the speedy restoration of the harmony and unity of the government by a firm, yet just and liberal bearing, co-operating with the deliberate and loyal action of the American people.

The United States have had too many assurances and manifestations of the friendship and goodwill of Great Britain to entertain any doubt that these considerations, and such others as your own large experience of the working of our federal system will suggest, will have their just influence with the British government, and will prevent that government from yielding to solicitations to intervene in any unfriendly way in the domestic concerns of our country.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

GEORGE M. DALLAS, Esq., *London*.

The same, *mutatis mutandis*, to E. G. Fair, Esq., Brussels; Theo. S. Fay, Esq., Berne; Jos. A. Wright, Esq., Berlin; J. G. Jones, Esq., Vienna; J. Williams, Esq., Constantinople; Charles J. Faulkner, Esq., Paris; John Appleton, Esq., St. Petersburg; Henry C. Murphy, Esq., Hague; William Preston, Esq., Madrid.

[Inclosure.]

Extracts from the inaugural address of President Lincoln delivered on the fourth of March, 1861.

I hold that, in contemplation of universal law, and of the Constitution, the Union of these States is perpetual. Perpetuity is implied, if not expressed, in the fundamental law of all national governments. It is safe to assert that no government proper ever had a provision in its organic law for its own termination. Continue to execute all the express provisions of our national Constitution, and the Union will endure forever—it being impossible to destroy it except by some action not provided for in the instrument itself.

It follows, from these views, that no State, upon its own mere motion, can lawfully get out of the Union; that *resolves* and *ordinances* to that effect are legally void; and that acts of violence, within any State or States, against the authority of the United States, are insurrectionary or revolutionary, according to circumstances.

I, therefore, consider that, in view of the Constitution and the laws, the Union is unbroken, and, to the extent of my ability, I shall take care, as the Constitution itself expressly enjoins upon me, that the laws of the Union be faithfully executed in all the States. Doing this I deem to be only a simple duty on my part; and I shall perform it, so far as practicable, unless my rightful masters, the American people, shall withhold the requisite means, or, in some authoritative manner, direct the contrary. I trust this will not be regarded as a menace, but only as the declared purpose of the Union, that it *will* constitutionally defend and maintain itself.

Mr. Dallas to Mr. Seward.

[Extracts.]

No. 325.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, March 22, 1861.

SIR: I have recently had the honor to receive your dispatches, numbered 304 and 305.

Having noticed that the dispatch No. 304, bearing date the 28th of February, respecting the newly-formed confederacy of seceded States, was in harmony as well with the views enunciated in the inaugural address on the 4th instant as with those of the presidential message of December last, I lost no time in seeking an interview with her Majesty's principal secretary of state for foreign affairs, and in stating the opposition which I am in that dispatch instructed to make to any recognition by the Queen of England of the independence of those who have thus attempted to throw off their federal obligations.

The necessary opportunity was accorded to me on the day after my receipt of the dispatch, yesterday. Lord John Russell then listened to the communication as one he expected; though on its purport the British cabinet, if they had interchanged opinions at all, had reached no definite conclusion as to their proper course of action.

I took the liberty to inquire whether any one professing to represent the southern republic had approached this government on the subject, and his lordship, with prompt frankness, assured me that he felt no hesitation in answering in the negative, adding that he had been shown a private letter from which he inferred that accredited ministers or commissioners, authorized to negotiate for the recognition, would shortly be sent by the provisional authorities of Montgomery.

I have the honor to be, sir, your most obedient servant,

G. M. DALLAS.

The Hon. the SECRETARY OF STATE, *Washington.*

[From British Blue Book, "North America," 1862, No. 1, p. 14.]

No. 19.

*Lord J. Russell to Mr. Dallas.*FOREIGN OFFICE, *March 21, 1861.*

Lord John Russell presents his compliments to Mr. Dallas, and has the honor to transmit to him herewith a draft of a dispatch which he proposes to address to Lord Lyons, her Majesty's minister at Washington, with reference to their conversation of yesterday, and to request that Mr. Dallas will be good enough to inform him whether he has correctly represented the purport of the dispatch from Judge Black.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," 1862, No. 1, p. 14.]

No. 20.

*Mr. Dallas to Lord J. Russell.*LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, March 21, 1861.

Mr. Dallas presents his compliments to Lord John Russell, and, returning the draft of a proposed dispatch to Lord Lyons, begs, in

answer to the question put to him, to express his opinion that the purport of the note from Judge Black, read to his lordship yesterday, is correctly represented in that dispatch.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," 1862, No. 1, p. 14.]

No. 21.

Lord J. Russell to Lord Lyons.

FOREIGN OFFICE, March 22, 1861.

MY LORD: The American minister called upon me yesterday afternoon, and read to me a dispatch of Judge Black, dated the 28th of February.

In this dispatch Judge Black expresses his conviction that States which have separated from the United States without any legal or constitutional right to do so will not be acknowledged as independent states by Great Britain. Her Majesty's government have shown, he said, so friendly an interest in the welfare of the United States, that it is due to them to state that the United States have not acknowledged the right of the seceding States to claim independence, and do not design to do so.

I replied to Mr. Dallas shortly and verbally, stating that, even if the government of the United States had been willing to acknowledge the separation of the seceding States as founded in right, her Majesty's government would have seen with great concern the dissolution of the Union which bound together the members of the American republic. That the opposition of the government of the United States to any such separation, and the denial by them of its legality, would make her Majesty's government very reluctant to take any step which might encourage or sanction the separation. That, however, it was impossible to state, at the present moment, in what shape the question might present itself; nor was it in my power to bind the British government to any particular course of conduct in cases of which the circumstances and the significance were at present unknown to us.

I am, &c.,

J. RUSSELL.

Mr. Dallas to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 329.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, April 5, 1861.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your dispatches, numbered 306 and 307, and a circular, dated the 9th of March, 1861, respecting the probable efforts of persons claiming to represent a southern provisional government to obtain the recognition of their independence by Great Britain.

Respecting this last-mentioned subject, I addressed yesterday, as soon as your instruction was received, a note to her Majesty's principal secretary of state for foreign affairs, requesting an early interview, deeming it not impossible that I might be enabled to send you something by this

steamer. My note, however, is yet unanswered, owing, I presume, to the absence of Lord John Russell from town. The commissioners from the new confederacy have not yet arrived, and may not arrive until late in this month. You were apprised by my dispatch of the 22d ultimo, (No. 325,) that, on the receipt from the department of your predecessor's No. 304, I had lost no time in placing the matter properly before this government. Your own views will be communicated in greater fullness when the opportunity is allowed me.

* * * * *

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

G. M. DALLAS.

The Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. Dallas to Mr. Seward.

No. 330.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, April 9, 1861.

SIR: Referring to my dispatch of the 5th instant, (No. 329,) I have now the honor to state that Lord John Russell accorded me an interview at the Foreign Office yesterday, and enabled me to submit fully to his consideration the representations of your circular [of March 9] with the inaugural address of the President.

We conversed for some time on the question of recognizing the alleged southern confederacy, of which no representative has yet appeared, and may not appear until the end of the month.

His lordship assured me with great earnestness that there was not the slightest disposition in the British government to grasp at any advantage which might be supposed to arise from the unpleasant domestic differences in the United States, but, on the contrary, that they would be highly gratified if those differences were adjusted and the Union restored to its former unbroken position.

I pressed upon him, in concluding, if that were the case—and I was quite convinced that it was—how important it must be that this country and France should abstain, at least for a considerable time, from doing what, by encouraging groundless hopes, would widen a breach still thought capable of being closed.

He seemed to think the matter not ripe for decision one way or the other, and remarked that what he had said was all that at present it was in his power to say. The coming of my successor, Mr. Adams, looked for from week to week, would doubtless be regarded as the appropriate and natural occasion for finally discussing and determining the question. In the intermediate time, whatever of vigilance and activity may be necessary shall, of course, and as a high duty, be exerted.

English opinion tends rather, I apprehend, to the theory that a peaceful separation may work beneficially for both groups of States and not injuriously affect the rest of the world. They cannot be expected to appreciate the weakness, discredit, complications, and dangers which we instinctively and justly ascribe to disunion.

I beg to add that a phase of this subject will be introduced in the House of Commons to-night by Lord Alfred Churchill, and that on the

15th instant a motion favoring the recognition will be pressed by Mr. W. H. Gregory, member for Galway.

I have the honor to be, sir, your most obedient servant,

G. M. DALLAS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD, *Secretary of State*.

[For parliamentary notices relating to belligerent recognition, see Parliamentary and Judicial Appendix No. 1.]

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 1, p. 19.]

No. 26.

Lord J. Russell to Lord Lyons.

FOREIGN OFFICE, April 12, 1861.

MY LORD: Mr. Dallas called upon me on the 8th instant, in pursuance of an appointment, and communicated to me a dispatch which he had received from Mr. Seward, United States Secretary of State, and of which I inclose a copy.*

There are several passages in this dispatch at which I might have taken exception, but I thought it best not to raise unnecessary questions; I therefore confined myself to the following observations:

I said that it was not the wish or intention of her Majesty's government to pronounce any judgment on the causes which had induced seven of the United States to secede from the rest. Whether, as to the past, those States had reason to complain that the terms of the compact of union had not been observed, or whether they had reason to apprehend that, for the future, justice would not be done to them, were questions which her Majesty's government did not pretend to decide. They had seen in the United States a free and prosperous community, with which they had been happy to maintain the most amicable relations.

Now that a secession had taken place, they were in no hurry to recognize the separation as complete and final. But, on the other hand, I could not bind her Majesty's government, nor tell how and when circumstances might arise which would make a decision necessary. That I must, therefore, decline to enter into any further discussion at the present moment, and could only assure him of our regret at the events which had recently occurred.

I am, &c.,

J. RUSSELL.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extracts.]

No. 2.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 10, 1861.

SIR: Although Great Britain and the United States possess adjacent dominions of large extent, and although they divide not very unequally

* See circular of March 9, ante.

a considerable portion of the commerce of the world, yet there are at present only two questions in debate between them. One of these concerns the line of boundary running through Puget's Sound, and involves the title to the island of San Juan. The other relates to a proposition for extinguishing the interest of the Hudson's Bay and Puget's Sound Agricultural Companies in the Territory of Washington. The discussion of these questions has hitherto been carried on here, and there is no necessity for removing it to London. It is expected to proceed amicably and result in satisfactory conclusions. It would seem, therefore, on first thought, that you would find nothing more to do in England than to observe and report current events, and to cultivate friendly sentiments there towards the United States. Nevertheless, the peculiar condition of our country in the present juncture renders these duties a task of considerable delicacy.

You will readily understand me as alluding to the attempts which are being made by a misguided portion of our fellow-citizens to detach some of the States and to combine them in a new organization under the name of the Confederate States of America. The agitators in this bad enterprise, justly estimating the influence of the European powers upon even American affairs, do not mistake in supposing that it would derive signal advantage from a recognition by any of those powers, and especially Great Britain. Your task, therefore, apparently so simple and easy, involves the responsibility of preventing the commission of an act by the government of that country which would be fraught with disaster, perhaps ruin, to our own.

* * * * *

It is much to be deplored that our representatives are to meet abroad agents of disunion, seeking foreign aid to effect what, unaided, is already seen to be desperate. You need not be informed that their success in Great Britain would probably render their success easy elsewhere.

* * * * *

If, as the President does not at all apprehend, you shall unhappily find her Majesty's government tolerating the application of the so-called seceding States, or wavering about it, you will not leave them to suppose for a moment that they can grant that application and remain the friends of the United States. You may even assure them promptly in that case that if they determine to recognize, they may at the same time prepare to enter into alliance with the enemies of this republic. You alone will represent your country at London, and you will represent the whole of it there. When you are asked to divide that duty with others, diplomatic relations between the government of Great Britain and this government will be suspended, and will remain so until it shall be seen which of the two is most strongly entrenched in the confidence of their respective nations and of mankind.

* * * * *

We freely admit that a nation may, and even ought, to recognize a new state which has absolutely and beyond question effected its independence, and permanently established its sovereignty; and that a recognition in such a case affords no just cause of offense to the government of the country from which the new state has so detached itself. On the other hand, we insist that a nation that recognizes a revolutionary state, with a view to aid in effecting its sovereignty and independence, commits a great wrong against the nation whose integrity is thus invaded, and makes itself responsible for a just and ample redress.

* * * * *

In the circumstances of the present case, it is clear that a recognition

of the so-called confederate nation must be deemed equivalent to a deliberate resolution by her Majesty's government that this American Union, which has so long constituted a sovereign nation, shall be now permanently dissolved, and cease to exist forever.

* * * * *

It remains to bring out distinctly a consideration to which I have already adverted. Great Britain has within the last forty-five years changed character and purpose. She has become a power for production rather than a power for destruction. She is committed, as it seems to us, to a policy of industry, not of ambition; a policy of peace, not of war. One has only to compare her present domestic condition with that of any former period to see that this new career on which she has entered is, as wise as it is humane and beneficent. Her success in this career requires peace throughout the civilized world, and nowhere so much as on this continent. Recognition by her of the so-called Confederate States would be intervention and war in this country. Permanent dismemberment of the American Union in consequence of that intervention would be perpetual war—civil war. The new confederacy, which in that case Great Britain would have aided into existence, must, like any other new state, seek to expand itself northward, westward, and southward. What part of this continent or of the adjacent islands would be expected to remain in peace?

The President would regard it as inconsistent with his habitually high consideration for the government and people of Great Britain to allow me to dwell longer on the merely commercial aspects of the question under discussion. Indeed, he will not for a moment believe that, upon consideration of merely financial gain, that government could be induced to lend its aid to a revolution designed to overthrow the institutions of this country, and involving ultimately the destruction of the liberties of the American people.

To recognize the independence of a new state, and so favor, possibly determine, its admission into the family of nations, is the highest possible exercise of sovereign power, because it affects in any case the welfare of two nations, and often the peace of the world. In the European system this power is now seldom attempted to be exercised without invoking a consultation or congress of nations. That system has not been extended to this continent. But there is even a greater necessity for prudence in such cases in regard to American States than in regard to the nations of Europe. A revolutionary change of dynasty, or even a disorganization and recombination of one or many states, therefore, do not long or deeply affect the general interests of society, because the ways of trade and habits of society remain the same. But a radical change effected in the political combinations existing on this continent, followed, as it probably would be, by moral convulsions of incalculable magnitude, would threaten the stability of society throughout the world.

Humanity has, indeed, little to hope for, if it shall, in this age of high improvement, be decided without a trial that the principle of international law, which regards nations as moral persons, bound so to act as to do to each other the least injury and the most good, is merely an abstraction too refined to be reduced into practice by the enlightened nations of western Europe. Seen in the light of this principle, the several nations of the earth constitute one great federal republic. When one of them casts its suffrages for the admission of a new member into that republic, it ought to act under a profound sense of moral obligation, and be governed by considerations as pure, disinter-

ated, and elevated as the general interest of society and the advancement of human nature.

The British empire itself is an aggregation of divers communities which cover a large portion of the earth and embrace one-fifth of its entire population. Some, at least, of these communities are held to their places in that system by bonds as fragile as the obligations of our own federal Union. The strain will some time come which is to try the strength of these bonds, though it will be of a different kind from that which is trying the cords of our confederation. Would it be wise for her Majesty's government on this occasion to set a dangerous precedent, or provoke retaliation? If Scotland and Ireland are at last reduced to quiet contentment, has Great Britain no dependency, island, or province left exposed along the whole circle of her empire, from Gibraltar through the West Indies and Canada till it begins again on the southern extremity of Africa?

The President will not dwell on the pleasing recollection that Great Britain, not yet a year ago, manifested by marked attention to the United States her desire for a cordial reunion, which, all ancient prejudices and passions being buried, should be a pledge of mutual interest and sympathy forever thereafter. The United States are not indifferent to the circumstances of common descent, language, customs, sentiments, and religion, which recommend a closer sympathy between themselves and Great Britain than either might expect in its intercourse with any other nation. The United States are one of many nations which have sprung from Great Britain herself. Other such nations are rising up in various parts of the globe. It has been thought by many who have studied the philosophy of modern history profoundly that the success of the nations thus deriving their descent from Great Britain might, through many ages, reflect back upon that kingdom the proper glories of its own great career. The government and people of Great Britain may mistake their commercial interests, but they cannot become either unnatural or indifferent to the impulses of an undying ambition to be distinguished as the leaders of the nations in the ways of civilization and humanity.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

President Lincoln's proclamation of April 15, 1861, calling for 75,000 State militia, to suppress the insurrection.

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A proclamation.

Whereas the laws of the United States have been for some time past, and now are, opposed, and the execution thereof obstructed, in the States of South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Florida, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas, by combinations too powerful to be suppressed by the ordinary course of judicial proceedings, or by the powers vested in the marshals by law:

Now, therefore, I, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States, in virtue of the power in me vested by the Constitution and the laws, have thought fit to call forth, and hereby do call forth, the militia of the several States of the Union, to the aggregate number of seventy-

five thousand, in order to suppress said combinations, and to cause the laws to be duly executed.

The details for this object will be immediately communicated to the State authorities through the War Department.

I appeal to all loyal citizens to favor, facilitate, and aid this effort to maintain the honor, the integrity, and the existence of our national Union, and the perpetuity of popular government, and to redress wrongs already long enough endured.

I deem it proper to say that the first service assigned to the forces hereby called forth will probably be to repossess the forts, places, and property which have been seized from the Union; and in every event the utmost care will be observed, consistently with the objects aforesaid, to avoid any devastation, any destruction of or interference with property, or any disturbance of peaceful citizens in any part of the country.

And I hereby command the persons composing the combinations aforesaid to disperse and retire peaceably to their respective abodes within twenty days from this date.

Deeming that the present condition of public affairs presents an extraordinary occasion, I do hereby, in virtue of the power in me vested by the Constitution, convene both houses of Congress.

Senators and representatives are therefore summoned to assemble at their respective chambers, at twelve o'clock, noon, on Thursday, the fourth day of July next, then and there to consider and determine such measures as, in their wisdom, the public safety and interest may seem to demand.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand, and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington, this fifteenth day of April, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-one, and of the independence of the United States the eighty-fifth.

[L.S.]

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

By the President:

WILLIAM H. SEWARD, *Secretary of State*.

Mr. Faulkner to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 119.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, April 15, 1861.

SIR: I called to-day upon Mr. Thouvenel at the ministry of foreign affairs, and was promptly admitted to an interview. Agreeably to your request, I handed to him a copy of the inaugural address of President Lincoln, and added that I was instructed by you to say to him that it embraced the views of the President of the United States upon the difficulties which now disturbed the harmony of the American Union, and also an exposition of the general policy which it was the purpose of the government to pursue with a view to the preservation of domestic peace and the maintenance of the federal Union.

* * * * *

I said to him that the President thought it not improbable that an appeal would be made before long by the "Confederated States" to

foreign powers, and, among others, to the government of France, for the recognition of their independence; that no such appeal having yet been made, it was premature and out of place to discuss any of the points involved in that delicate and important inquiry; but the government of the United States desired the fact to be known that, whenever any such application shall be made, it will meet with opposition from the minister who shall then represent that government at this court.

* * * * *

Mr. Thouvenel, in reply, said that no application had yet been made to him by the Confederate States, in any form, for the recognition of their independence; that the French government was not in the habit of acting hastily upon such questions, as might be seen by its tardiness in recognizing the new kingdom of Italy; that he believed the maintenance of the federal Union, in its integrity, was to be desired for the benefit of the people North and South, as well as for the interests of France, and the government of the United States might rest well assured that no hasty or precipitate action would be taken on that subject by the Emperor. But while he gave utterance of these views, he was equally bound to say that the practice and usage of the present century had fully established the right of *de facto* governments to recognition when a proper case was made out for the decision of foreign powers. Here the official interview ended.

* * * * *

I am, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

CHAS. J. FAULKNER.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD, *Secretary of State*.

[From British Blue Book, No. 1, 1862, "North America," p. 23.]

No. 31.

Lord Lyons to Lord J. Russell.

[Extract.]

WASHINGTON, April 22, 1861.

I have the honor to inclose copies of a proclamation of the President of the southern confederacy inviting application for letters of marque, and also a proclamation of the President of the United States declaring that southern privateers will be treated as pirates, and announcing a blockade of the southern ports.

I lost no time in taking measures to communicate the contents of these proclamations as fast as possible, both by telegraph and post, to Rear-Admiral Sir Alexander Milne. The subsequent interruption of communication with the North has prevented my learning how far my measures were successful.

I am informed that an official notification of the blockade will be sent to the foreign legations here in the course of the day.

Under ordinary circumstances the season during which British vessels frequent southern ports closes in May and does not re-open until October. I understand that some alarm is felt in the North respecting the southern privateers, but it must be supposed that the navy of the United States will suffice to arrest their operations. If these privateers, however, make any head in the Gulf of Mexico, it may perhaps be advisable

that a British squadron should be sent there to insure the safety of the British merchant vessels.

[For communication of *official* copy of proclamation of the President of April 19, see Lord Lyons to Lord Russell, of the 27th of April.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

[Extracts.]

No. 3.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 22, 1861.

* * * * *

The agitators in this case have, perhaps, not unnaturally carried their bad cause before foreign states by an appeal for recognition of the independence they have proclaimed, and which they are committed to establish by arms. Prudence requires that we oppose that appeal. The President believes that you will be able to do this in such a manner as will at once comport with the high consideration for his Imperial Majesty which this government habitually entertains, and a due sense of the dignity and honor of the American people.

* * * * *

The President neither expects nor desires any intervention, or even any favor, from the government of France, or any other, in this emergency. Whatever else he may consent to do, he will never invoke nor even admit foreign interference or influence in this or any other controversy in which the government of the United States may be engaged with any portion of the American people. It has been simply his aim to show that the present controversy furnishes no one ground on which a great and friendly power, like France, can justly lend aid or sympathy to the party engaged in insurrection, and therefore he instructs you to insist on the practice of neutrality by the government of the Emperor, as all our representatives are instructed to insist on the neutrality of the several powers to which they are accredited.

Not entertaining the least apprehension of the departure from that course by his Majesty's government, it is not without some reluctance that the President consents to the suggestion of some considerations affecting France herself, which you may urge in support of it.

* * * * *

Foreign intervention would oblige us to treat those who should yield it as allies of the insurrectionary party, and to carry on the war against them as enemies. The case would not be relieved, but, on the contrary, would only be aggravated, if several European states should combine in that intervention. The President and the people of the United States deem the Union, which would then be at stake, worth all the cost and all the sacrifices of a contest with the world in arms, if such a contest should prove inevitable.

* * * * *

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

Hon. WILLIAM L. DAYTON, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 4.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, April 27, 1861.

SIR: A dispatch has just been received from Mr. Dallas, dated the 9th of April instant, the record of which (No. 330) you doubtless will find in the archives of the legation when you shall have arrived at London.

In that paper Mr. Dallas states that he had had a conversation with Lord John Russell, the minister of foreign affairs of her Britannic Majesty's government, on the subject of a protest against any recognition of the so-called Confederate States of America, the protest having been presented to him by Mr. Dallas, in obedience to a circular letter of instructions sent to him from this department, under the date of the 9th ultimo.

Mr. Dallas represents that his lordship assured him, with great earnestness, that there was not the slightest disposition in the British government to grasp at any advantage which might be supposed to arise from the unpleasant domestic differences in the United States; but, on the contrary, that they would be highly gratified if those differences were adjusted and the Union restored to its former unbroken position.

This, by itself, would be very gratifying to the President. Mr. Dallas, however, adds that he endeavored to impress upon his lordship how important it must be that Great Britain and France should abstain, at least for a considerable time, from doing what, by encouraging groundless hopes, would widen a breach still thought capable of being closed; but that his lordship seemed to think the matter not ripe for decision one way or the other, and remarked that what he had already said was all that at present it was in his power to say.

When you shall have read the instructions at large which have been sent to you, you will hardly need to be told that these last remarks of his lordship are by no means satisfactory to this government. Her Britannic Majesty's government is at liberty to choose whether it will retain the friendship of this government by refusing all aid and comfort to its enemies, now in flagrant rebellion against it, as we think the treaties existing between the two countries require, or whether the government of her Majesty will take the precarious benefits of a different course.

You will lose no time in making known to her Britannic Majesty's government that the President regards the answer of his lordship as possibly indicating a policy that this government would be obliged to deem injurious to its rights and derogating from its dignity.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

NOTIFICATION OF BLOCKADE.

CIRCULAR.

[Said to have been unofficially communicated to the British government by Mr. Dallas in London, May 11, 1861.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, April 20, 1861.

SIR: As it is not improbable that mercenary or badly enterprising men, lured by the seductions held out in a recent proclamation under the pre-

tended authority of the so-called Confederate States of America, may attempt to fit out privateers in the ports of Great Britain for the purpose of aggression on the commerce of the United States, I am directed by the President to instruct you to be vigilant, to the extent of your power, toward preventing any such unlawful purpose. To this end you will promptly impart to the proper authorities any facts upon the subject which may come to your knowledge. A copy of the President's proclamation of the 19th instant is herewith inclosed, from which you will perceive that the pains and penalties of piracy will be visited on any person who may molest a vessel of the United States.

I am, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

G. M. DALLAS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

The same *mutatis mutandis* to diplomatic and consular representatives abroad.

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

A proclamation.

Whereas an insurrection against the government of the United States has broken out in the States of South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Florida, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas, and the laws of the United States for the collection of the revenue cannot be effectually executed therein conformably to that provision of the Constitution which requires duties to be uniform throughout the United States;

And whereas a combination of persons, engaged in such insurrection, have threatened to grant pretended letters of marque to authorize the bearers thereof to commit assaults on the lives, vessels, and property of good citizens of the country lawfully engaged in commerce on the high seas and in waters of the United States;

And whereas an executive proclamation has been already issued, requiring the persons engaged in these disorderly proceedings to desist therefrom, calling out a militia force for the purpose of repressing the same, and convening Congress in extraordinary session to deliberate and determine thereon:

Now, therefore, I, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States, with a view to the same purposes before mentioned, and to the protection of the public peace, and the lives and property of quiet and orderly citizens pursuing their lawful occupations, until Congress shall have assembled and deliberated on the said unlawful proceedings, or until the same shall have ceased, have further deemed it advisable to set on foot a blockade of the ports within the States aforesaid, in pursuance of the laws of the United States and of the law of nations in such case provided. For this purpose a competent force will be posted so as to prevent entrance and exit of vessels from the ports aforesaid. If, therefore, with a view to violate such blockade, a vessel shall approach, or shall attempt to leave either of the said ports, she will be duly warned by the commander of one of the blockading vessels, who will indorse on her register the fact and date of such warning, and if the same vessel shall again attempt to enter or leave the blockaded port, she will be captured and sent to the nearest convenient port, for such proceedings against her and her cargo as prize as may be deemed advisable.

And I hereby proclaim and declare that if any person, under the pre-

tended authority of the said States, or under any other pretense, shall molest a vessel of the United States, or the persons or cargo on board of her, such person will be held amenable to the laws of the United States for the prevention and punishment of piracy.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand, and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington, this nineteenth day of April, in the [L. S.] year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-one, and of the independence of the United States the eighty-fifth.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

By the President:

WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

[Copied from the New York Herald of April 20, 1861.—By telegraph.]

BLOCKADE OF THE SOUTHERN PORTS—PROCLAMATION FROM PRESIDENT LINCOLN.

WASHINGTON, April 19, 1861.

The President has issued a proclamation stating that an insurrection against the government of the United States has broken out in the States of South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Florida, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas, and the law of the United States for the collection of the revenue cannot be effectually executed therein conformably to that provision of the Constitution which requires duties to be uniform throughout the United States, and further that a combination of persons engaged in such insurrection have threatened to grant pretended letters of marque to authorize the bearers thereof to commit assaults on the lives, vessels and property of good citizens of the country lawfully engaged in commerce on the high seas and in the waters of the United States and whereas, the President says an executive proclamation has already been issued requiring the persons engaged in these disorderly proceedings to desist, therefore calling out a militia force for the purpose of repressing the same, and convening Congress in extraordinary session to deliberate and determine thereon. The President, with a view to the same purposes before mentioned, and to the protection of the public peace, and the lives and property of its orderly citizens pursuing their lawful occupations, until Congress shall have assembled and deliberated on the said unlawful proceedings, or until the same shall have ceased, has further deemed it advisable to set on foot a blockade of the ports within the States aforesaid in pursuance of the laws of the United States and the law of nations in such cases provided. For this purpose a competent force will be posted so as to prevent the entrance and exit of vessels from the ports aforesaid. If, therefore, with a view to violate the blockade, a vessel shall attempt to leave any of the said ports, she will be duly warned by the commander of one of the said blockading vessels, who will endorse on her register the fact and date of such warning, and if the same vessel still again attempt to enter or leave the blockaded she will be captured and sent to the nearest convenient port for such proceedings against her and her cargo as may be deemed advisable.

[The above is a true copy, word for word and letter for letter, from the newspaper named, and being republished in the London papers of May

NOTE.

On pages 22-23, instead of the words from "The above" to "May 14th," inclusive, substitute the following words:

[The steamship *Persia* (from New York, April 25, 1861) arrived at Queenstown May 4th, and at Liverpool May 5th, with the New York Herald containing the above notice of the President's proclamation. The steamer *Canadian* (from Portland April 20, 1861) arrived at Londonderry on the 1st of May, and at Liverpool on the 2d of May. The London Daily News of May 3d, and the London Times, May 4th, published a notice of the proclamation received by the *Canadian*, which differed from the above version from the New York Herald in the omission of the words "for the collection of the revenue," in the fourth and fifth lines, and in some other unimportant respects. The official copy of the proclamation, transmitted by Lord Lyons on the 27th April (see No. I, from British Blue Book, page 23), was received at the Foreign office on the 14th May, and was so marked.]

3, is the only notification of the blockade which the authorities at London received previous to the *unofficial* copy transmitted by Lord Lyons April 22, marked "received May 10," and the *official* copy transmitted April 27 and "received May 14."]

Proclamation of April 27, extending the blockade.

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

A proclamation.

Whereas, for the reasons assigned in my proclamation of the 19th instant, a blockade of the ports of the States of South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas was ordered to be established;

And whereas, since that date, public property of the United States has been seized, the collection of the revenue obstructed, and duly commissioned officers of the United States, while engaged in executing the orders of their superiors, have been arrested and held in custody as prisoners, or have been impeded in the discharge of their official duties without due legal process, by persons claiming to act under authorities of the States of Virginia and North Carolina:

An efficient blockade of the ports of those States will also be established.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand, and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington, this twenty-seventh day of April, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-
[L. s.] one, and of the independence of the United States the eighty-fifth.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

By the President:

WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Official notification of proclamations of blockade of April 19 and 27, 1861, with the respective dates of their receipt in London.

[From British Blue Book of 1861, entitled "Correspondence with the United States government respecting blockade," p. 1.]

No. 1.

Lord Lyons to Lord J. Russell.

[Extract.]

WASHINGTON, April 27, 1861.

I have the honor to transmit to your lordship herewith a copy of a note which I have received to-day from the Secretary of State of the United States, communicating to me printed copies of the President's proclamation of the 19th April, declaring a blockade of the ports of the

States of South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas. I inclose two of those copies of the proclamation which were sent to me with the note.

The Secretary of State further informs me, in the same note, that another proclamation has been signed by the President, establishing a blockade of the ports of the States of Virginia and North Carolina.

[Inclosure No. 1.]

Mr. Seward to Lord Lyons.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 27, 1861.

The undersigned, Secretary of State of the United States, has the honor to communicate to Lord Lyons the accompanying printed copies of the President's proclamation of the 19th instant, declaring a blockade of the ports of the States of South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Florida, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas.

The undersigned has the honor also to inform Lord Lyons that another proclamation has been signed by the President, and will be published to-morrow, establishing a blockade of the ports of Virginia and North Carolina.

The undersigned, &c.,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

[For inclosure No. 2, which is the proclamation communicated, see *ante* Mr. Seward to Mr. Dallas, of April 20.]

[From British Blue Book of 1861, entitled "Correspondence with the United States government respecting blockade," p. 2.]

No. 2.

Lord Lyons to Lord J. Russell.

[Extract.]

WASHINGTON, May 2, 1861.

MY LORD: I have the honor to inclose a copy of the note by which I acknowledged the receipt of Mr. Seward's note of the 27th ultimo, announcing the intention of this government to set on foot a blockade of the southern ports. I was careful so to word my note as to show that I accepted Mr. Seward's communication as an announcement of an intention to set on foot a blockade, not as a notification of the actual commencement of one. I believe that most of my colleagues made answers in the same sense.

I have the honor to transmit to your lordship copies of the President's proclamation announcing the extension of the blockade to the ports of Virginia and North Carolina, which have been sent to me in a blank cover from the State Department.

I have, &c.,

LYONS.

[Inclosure No. 1.]

Lord Lyons to Mr. Seward.

WASHINGTON, April 29, 1861.

The undersigned, her Britannic Majesty's envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to the United States of America, has the honor to acknowledge the receipt of a note of the day before yesterday's date from the Secretary of State, communicating to him a proclamation which announces, among other things, that a blockade of the ports of South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Florida, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas will be set on foot in pursuance of the law of the United States and the law of nations, and that for this purpose a competent force will be posted so as to prevent the entrance and exit of vessels.

The Secretary of State has, moreover, done the undersigned the honor to inform him in the same note that it is intended to set on foot also a blockade of the ports of Virginia and North Carolina.

The undersigned, &c.,

LYONS.

[For inclosure No. 2, which is the proclamation of April 27, see *ante*.]

[From British Blue Book of 1861, entitled "Correspondence with the United States government respecting blockade," p. 6.]

No. 3.

Lord Lyons to Lord J. Russell.

[Extract.]

WASHINGTON, May 4, 1861.

In my dispatch of the 2d instant I had the honor to report to your lordship that Mr. Seward had promised, on the 29th ultimo, to send me a copy of the instructions issued to the officers of the squadron to be employed in blockading the southern ports.

I took measures this morning to remind Mr. Seward privately of this promise; in return I received the following communication from the State Department:

"The Secretary of the Navy has furnished us with a copy of his instructions about the blockade, but as we have not been able to find a precedent for communicating them to the ministers of foreign governments, you must not expect a copy at present. You may, however, be thus informally assured that the blockade will be conducted as strictly according to the recognized rules of public law, and with as much liberality towards neutrals, as any blockade ever was by a belligerent."

Upon this I caused Mr. Buchanan's note to Mr. Pakenham of the 29th of December, 1846, to be pointed out to Mr. Seward as supplying a precedent for the confidential communication of instructions concerning a blockade.

The following was written to me in answer:

"I have shown Mr. Seward the precedent to which you refer, but he does not think it would justify him in furnishing a copy of the instructions; for, if given to one they must be given to all, which might lead to

their inconvenient publicity. The blockade, however, will be in strict conformity to the principles mentioned by Mr. Buchanan. The proclamation is mere notice of an intention to carry it into effect, and the existence of the blockade will be made known in proper form by the blockading vessels."

LYONS.

[From British Blue Book of 1861, entitled "Correspondence with the United States government respecting blockade," p. 7.]

No. 4.

Lord Lyons to Lord J. Russell.

[Extracts.]

WASHINGTON, May 11, 1861.

MY LORD: With reference to my dispatches of the 27th ultimo, and of the 2d and 4th instant, I have the honor to transmit to your lordship copies of a correspondence which I have held with the Secretary of State of the United States relative to the blockade of the southern ports.

I have not received intelligence of the issue of any notification announcing the actual commencement of the effective blockade of any of the ports, except the notification concerning the ports of Virginia and North Carolina, of which I transmitted to your lordship, with my dispatch of the 2d instant, a copy taken from a newspaper, and of which a copy forms also inclosure 17 in this dispatch.

I have, &c.,

LYONS.

[Inclosure No. 15.]

Mr. Seward to Lord Lyons.

WASHINGTON, May 11, 1861.

MY LORD: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your note of the 9th instant, in which application is made for certain information regarding the blockade, and to transmit to you herewith the copy of a letter of this date from the Secretary of the Navy, to whom the matter was referred, in answer to your inquiry.

I have, &c.,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

[Inclosure No. 16.]

Mr. Welles to Mr. Seward.

NAVY DEPARTMENT, May 9, 1861.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of yesterday inclosing a note of Lord Lyons relative to British vessels in

Virginia waters, which it is desired to exempt from the operation of the blockade, and inquiring when the blockade of the ports of Virginia may be considered to have commenced; also "whether the exemption asked for by Lord Lyons may with propriety be granted."

In answer to the inquiry, I beg leave to refer you to a copy, herewith inclosed, of the notice issued by Flag Officer Prendergrast on the 30th of April, warning all persons that he had a sufficient force to carry into effect the blockade. This notice was sent to the Baltimore and Norfolk papers, and by one or more of them published.

Fifteen days have been specified as a limit for neutrals to leave the ports after actual blockade has commenced, with or without cargo, and there are yet remaining five or six days for neutrals to leave. With proper diligence on the part of persons interested, I see no reason for exemption to any.

I am, &c.,

GIDEON WELLES.

[Inclosure No. 17.]

Proclamation.

To all whom it may concern :

I hereby call attention to the proclamation of his excellency Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States, under date of the 27th April, 1861, for an efficient blockade of the ports of Virginia and North Carolina, and warn all persons interested that I have a sufficient naval force there for the purpose of carrying out that proclamation.

All vessels passing the capes of Virginia, coming from a distance, and ignorant of the proclamation, will be warned off, and those passing Fortress Monroe will be required to anchor under the guns of the fort and subject themselves to an examination.

G. J. PENDERGRAST,
Commanding Home Squadron.

UNITED STATES FLAG-SHIP CUMBERLAND,
Off Fortress Monroe, Virginia, April 30, 1861.

Further official notices of the establishment of the United States blockade at ports on the southern coast, as communicated to the British government and published in British Blue Book for 1862, "North America," No. 8.

No. 2.

Consul Bunch to Lord J. Russell.

[Extract.]

CHARLESTON, May 15, 1861.

I have the honor to inform your lordship that this port and the adjacent coast were blockaded by the United States steam-frigate Niagara on Saturday the 11th instant, in conformity with the proclamation of the President of the United States dated the 19th of April last.

No. 6.

Lord Lyons to Lord J. Russell.

[Extract.]

WASHINGTON, May 23, 1861.

MY LORD: I have received a dispatch from Mr. Magee, acting consul at Mobile, dated the 16th instant, informing me that the British bark ——— had arrived at that place from Grimsby, in ballast, on the previous day, having been warned off the harbor of Pensacola by United States cruizers.

Mr. Magee states that the following indorsement was made on the register of the ———: "Boarded by the United States squadron, May 13, 1861, and warned not to enter the harbor of Pensacola."

It would appear, therefore, that on the 13th instant an effective blockade existed at Pensacola, and that up to the 16th instant there was no blockade of Mobile.

I have, &c.,

LYONS.

No. 16.

Lord Lyons to Lord J. Russell.

WASHINGTON, June 11, 1861.

MY LORD: I have the honor to inclose a copy of a dispatch from Mr. Acting Consul Fullarton, acquainting me that an effective blockade of Savannah was announced to have commenced on the 28th ultimo.

I have, &c.,

LYONS.

[Inclosure.]

Acting Consul Fullarton to Lord Lyons.

[Extract.]

SAVANNAH, June 1, 1861.

MY LORD: I have the honor to report to your lordship that the blockade of this port was commenced on the 28th ultimo, by the arrival off the bar of the United States steamer Union, of about six hundred tons, and mounting five guns, one of a squadron of four men-of-war stationed off the coast for the purpose of blockading this port and Charleston.

* * * * *
I have, &c.,

A. FULLARTON.

No. 17.

Lord Lyons to Lord J. Russell.

[Extract.]

WASHINGTON, June 11, 1861.

MY LORD: I have the honor to inclose a copy of a dispatch dated the 27th ultimo, from Mr. Acting Consul Magee, informing me that the port

of Mobile was stated to be effectively blockaded by the United States steamer Powhatan.

LYONS.

[Inclosure No. 2.]

Acting Consul Magee to Lord Lyons.

[Extract.]

MOBILE, May 27, 1861.

I beg leave to inform your lordship that the report here is, that this port is blockaded by the United States steam frigate Powhatan, and that Colonel Hardee, in command of Fort Morgan at the entrance of this harbor, has been officially notified of the same.

No. 36.

Consul Lynn to Lord J. Russell.

[Extract.]

GALVESTON, July 3, 1861.

MY LORD: I have to report to your lordship that a blockade of the port of Galveston was established yesterday about noon by the United States armed steamship South Carolina.

I have, &c.,

ARTHUR T. LYNN.

No. 39.

Lord Lyons to Lord J. Russell.

[Extract.]

WASHINGTON, July 29, 1861.

MY LORD: I have the honor to transmit to your lordship a copy of a portscript which was added by Mr. Consul Lynn on the 3d instant to a dispatch dated two days previously, and which announces that a blockade of the port of Galveston was established on the 2d instant.

I inclose, also, two printed copies of the notification of the blockade, which were sent to me by Mr. Lynn. The last date in them, "2d June," is, I presume, a misprint for "2d July."

I have, &c.,

LYONS.

[Inclosure No. 1.]

Postscript to Consul Lynn's dispatch to Lord Lyons, dated Galveston, July 1, 1861.

[Extract.]

JULY 3, 1861.

The detention to the mail packet enables me to report to your lordship that the blockade of this port was established yesterday about noon by the armed steamer South Carolina, James Alden commanding.

ARTHUR T. LYNN.

[Inclosure No. 2.]

Notification of the blockade of Galveston.

The following is the reply of Captain Alden to Captain Moore's note:

"UNITED STATES STEAMER SOUTH CAROLINA,
"Off Galveston, July 2, 1861.

"In answer to your communication of this date, I take the liberty of inclosing a declaration of blockade, which I am sent here to enforce, and am, &c.,

"JAMES ALDEN,
"Commander United States Steamer South Carolina.
"Captain JOHN O. MOORE, C. S. A. &c."

"Declaration of blockade.

"To all whom it may concern:

"I, William Mervine, flag officer, commanding the United States naval forces composing the Gulf squadron, give notice that, by virtue of the authority and power in me vested, and in pursuance of the proclamation of his Excellency the President of the United States, promulgated under date of April 19 and 27, 1861, respectively, that an effective blockade of the port of Galveston, Texas, has been established, and will be rigidly enforced and maintained against all vessels (public armed vessels of foreign powers alone excepted) which attempt to enter or depart from said port.

"WILLIAM MERVINE,
"Flag Officer United States Flag-ship Mississippi, June 8, 1861.

"I certify that the above is a true copy.

"JAMES ALDEN,
"Commander United States Navy.

"Neutral vessels will be allowed fifteen days to depart from this date, viz., June 2, 1861.

"JAMES ALDEN, Commanding."

[Note by Lord Lyons.—June 2d is apparently a misprint for July 2d.]

No. 55.

Consul Bunch to Lord J. Russell.

[Extract.]

CHARLESTON, July 25, 1861.

MY LORD: I have the honor to transmit to your lordship herewith four copies of a proclamation issued on the 13th instant by Flag Officer Pendergrast, of the United States navy, the commander-in-chief of the West India squadron, relative to the blockade of the ports of North Carolina, which he states that he is in a condition to render effective from that date.

I have, &c.,

ROBERT BUNCH.

[Inclosure No. 1.]

Proclamation.

UNITED STATES FLAG-SHIP ROANOKE,
Off Charleston, July 13, 1861.

To all whom it may concern :

I hereby call attention to the proclamation of his excellency Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States, under date of the 27th April, 1861, for an efficient blockade of the ports of Virginia and North Carolina, and warn all persons interested that I have a sufficient naval force here for the purpose of carrying out that proclamation.

All vessels entering the ports of North Carolina, or hovering about the coast of the same, will subject themselves to capture. Those coming from abroad, and ignorant of the blockade, will be warned off.

All vessels bound to the capes of Virginia will be allowed to proceed by having their papers indorsed, and will be allowed to enter any of the ports of Maryland.

Fifteen days after this date the above proclamation will be rigidly enforced against all vessels.

G. J. PENDERGRAST,
Flag Officer, Commanding West India Squadron.

Notice of blockade of the port of Appalachticola not published in British Blue Book as above.

DECLARATION OF BLOCKADE.

To all whom it may concern :

I, William Mervine, flag officer commanding the United States naval forces composing the Gulf squadron, give notice, that by virtue of the authority and power in me vested, and in pursuance of the proclamation of his excellency the President of the United States, promulgated under date of April 19 and 27, 1861, respectively, that an effective blockade of the port of Appalachticola, Florida, has been established and will be rigidly enforced and maintained against all vessels (public armed ves-

sels of foreign powers alone excepted) which shall attempt to enter or depart from said port.

WM. MERVINE,
Flag Officer, Commanding Gulf Blockading Squadron.

U. S. STEAM FLAG-SHIP MISSISSIPPI, *June 7, 1861.*

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 4.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, May 31, 1861.

SIR: *

I have likewise to acknowledge the reception of a printed circular addressed to my predecessor, Mr. Dallas, and dated the 27th of April, 1861, transmitting the proclamation of the President declaring the blockade of the ports of Virginia and North Carolina.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

[Extracts.]

No. 6.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, May 27, 1861.

On the same day, to wit, the 25th of the present month, I sent to Mr. Thouvenel a copy of the President's proclamation of the blockade of the ports of Virginia and North Carolina, referring at the same time to the previous blockade of the other southern ports. A copy of my note is attached, marked letter O.

With much consideration, your obedient servant,
WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

O.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Thouvenel.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, May 24, 1861.

SIR: I beg to inclose to your excellency a copy of a proclamation issued by the President of the United States on the 27th of April last, establishing a blockade of the ports of the States of Virginia and North Carolina.

A prior proclamation, dated 19th April last, established a blockade of the ports of the States of South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas, of which your excellency has doubtless already had notice.

With much respect, I have the honor to be your excellency's obedient servant,

WM. L. DAYTON.

Mr. THOUVENEL,
Minister of Foreign Affairs.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 1, 1862, pp. 20, 21.]

No. 28.

Lord J. Russell to the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty.

FOREIGN OFFICE, May 1, 1861.

MY LORDS: The intelligence which reached this country by the last mail from the United States gives reason to suppose that a civil war between the northern and southern States of that confederacy was imminent, if indeed it might not be considered to have already begun.

Simultaneously with the arrival of this news, a telegram purporting to have been conveyed to Halifax from the United States was received, which announced that the president of the southern confederacy had taken steps for issuing letters of marque against the vessels of the northern States.

If such is really the case, it is obvious that much inconvenience may be occasioned to the numerous British vessels engaged in trade on the coast of the United States and in the Gulf of Mexico, and that timely provision should be made for their protection against undue molestation by reason of the maritime operations of the hostile parties; and her Majesty has accordingly commanded me to signify to your lordships her pleasure that adequate re-enforcements should forthwith be sent to her Majesty's squadron on the North American and West Indian station, so that the admiral in command may be able duly to provide for the protection of British shipping in any emergency that may occur.

I need scarcely observe to your lordships that it may be right to apprise the admiral that, much as her Majesty regrets the prospect of civil war breaking out in a country in the happiness and peace of which her Majesty takes the deepest interest, it is her Majesty's pleasure that nothing should be done by her naval forces which should indicate any partiality or preference for either party in the contest that may ensue.

I am, &c.,

J. RUSSELL.

Mr. Dallas to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 333.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, May 2, 1861.

* * * * *

You have doubtless noticed that the motion of Mr. Gregory, in the House of Commons, on the recognition of the southern confederation—

3 A C—VOL. I

which motion I mentioned at the conclusion of my No. 330—underwent postponement from the 16th to the 30th ultimo, and has again been deferred a fortnight, for the reasons stated in the extract from the Times newspaper of the 30th April, hereto annexed.

The solicitude felt by Lord John Russell as to the effect of certain measures represented as likely to be adopted by the President, induced him to request me to call at his private residence yesterday. I did so. He told me that the three representatives of the southern confederacy were here; that he had not seen them, but was not unwilling to do so, *unofficially*; that there existed an understanding between this government and that of France, which would lead both to take the same course as to recognition, whatever that course might be; and he then referred to the rumor of a meditated blockade of southern ports and their discontinuance as ports of entry—topics on which I had heard nothing, and could therefore say nothing. But as I informed him that Mr. Adams had apprised me of his intention to be on his way hither, in the steamship Niagara, which left Boston on the 1st May, and that he would probably arrive in less than two weeks, by the 12th or 15th instant, his lordship acquiesced in the expediency of disregarding mere rumor, and waiting the full knowledge to be brought by my successor.

The motion of Mr. Gregory, therefore, may be further postponed, at his lordship's suggestion.

I have the honor to be, sir, your most obedient servant;

G. M. DALLAS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

[For parliamentary notices of motion for recognition see Parliamentary and judicial Appendix No. 1.]

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

[Extract.]

No. 7.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 4, 1861.

SIR: The dispatches of your predecessor, Nos. 117, 119, and 120, have been received; the latter, acknowledging the receipt of our letter of recall and announcing his intended return, requires no special notice.

The instructions heretofore transmitted to you will show you the President's views on the subject Mr. Faulkner has discussed, and these will be your guide, notwithstanding any different opinions your predecessor may have expressed or left on record at Paris.

No. 119 bears date of the 15th of April last, and contains a report of an official conversation, and also of an unofficial one held between Mr. Faulkner and Mr. Thouvenel.

In the former conversation Mr. Thouvenel asked Mr. Faulkner whether there is not some diversity of opinion in the cabinet of the President as to the proper mode of meeting the difficulties which now disturb the relations of the States and the general government. Mr. Faulkner, in reply, said that he had no information on the subject.

The matter is of no great moment, yet it is desirable that there be no misapprehension of the true state of the government in the present emergency.

You may, therefore, recall that conversation to Mr. Thouvenel's

memory, and then assure him explicitly that there is no difference of opinion whatever between the President and his constitutional advisers, or among those advisers themselves, concerning the policy that has been pursued, and which is now prosecuted by the administration, in regard to the unhappy disturbance, existing in this country. The path of executive duty has thus far been too plainly marked out by stern necessities to be mistaken, while the solemnity of the great emergency, and the responsibilities it devolves, have extinguished in the public councils every emotion but those of loyalty and patriotism. It is not in the hands of this administration that this government is to come to an end at all—much less for want of harmony in devotion to the country.

Mr. Thouvenel's declaration that the United States may rest well assured that no hasty or precipitate action will be taken on the subject of the apprehended application of the insurrectionists for a recognition of the independence of the so-called Confederate States is entirely satisfactory, although it was attended by a reservation of views concerning general principles applicable to cases that need not now be discussed.

In the unofficial conversation Mr. Faulkner says that he himself expressed the opinion that force would not be resorted to to coerce the so-called seceding States into submission to the federal authority, and that the only solution of the difficulty would be found in such modifications of the constitutional compact as would invite the seceding States back into the Union, or a peaceable acquiescence in the assertion of their claim to a separate sovereignty.

The time when these questions had any pertinency or plausibility has passed away. The United States waited patiently while their authority was defied in turbulent assemblies, and in seditious preparations, willing to hope that mediation, offered on all sides, would conciliate and induce the disaffected parties to return to a better mind.

But the case is now altogether changed. The insurgents have instituted revolution, with open, flagrant, deadly war, to compel the United States to acquiesce in the dismemberment of the Union. The United States have accepted this civil war as an inevitable necessity. The constitutional remedies for all the complaints of the insurgents are still open to them, and will remain so. But, on the other hand, the land and naval forces of the Union have been put into activity to restore the federal authority and to save the Union from danger.

You cannot be too decided or too explicit in making known to the French government that there is not now, nor has there been, nor will there be any, the least idea existing in this government of suffering a dissolution of this Union to take place in any way whatever.

There will be here only one nation and one government, and there will be the same republic and the same constitutional Union that have already survived a dozen national changes, and changes of government in almost every other country. These will stand hereafter, as they are now, objects of human wonder and human affection.

You have seen, on the eve of your departure, the elasticity of the national spirit, the vigor of the national government, and the lavish devotion of the national treasures to this great cause. Tell Mr. Thouvenel, then, with the highest consideration and good feeling, that the thought of a dissolution of this Union, peaceably or by force, has never entered into the mind of any candid statesman here, and it is high time that it be dismissed by statesmen in Europe.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 3, 1862, p. 1.]

No. 1.

Lord J. Russell to Earl Cowley.

[Extract.]

FOREIGN OFFICE, May 6, 1861.

MY LORD: Although her Majesty's government have received no dispatches from Lord Lyons by the mail which has just arrived, the communication between Washington and New York being interrupted, yet the accounts which have reached them from some of her Majesty's consuls, coupled with what has appeared in the public prints, are sufficient to show that a civil war has broken out among the States which lately composed the American Union.

Other nations have, therefore, to consider the light in which, with reference to that war, they are to regard the confederacy into which the southern States have united themselves; and it appears to her Majesty's government that, looking at all the circumstances of the case, they cannot hesitate to admit that such confederacy is entitled to be considered as a belligerent, and, as such, invested with all the rights and prerogatives of a belligerent.

I have stated this to Lord Lyons in the dispatch of which I inclose a copy for your excellency's information.*

In making known to M. Thouvenel the opinion of her Majesty's government on this point, your excellency will add that you are instructed to call the attention of the French government to the bearing which this unfortunate contest threatens to have on the rights and interests of neutral nations.

On the one hand, President Lincoln, in behalf of the northern portion of the late United States, has issued a proclamation declaratory of an intention to subject the ports of the southern portion of the late Union to a rigorous blockade; on the other hand, President Davis, on behalf of the southern portion of the late Union, has issued a proclamation declaratory of an intention to grant letters of marque for cruisers to be employed against the commerce of the north.

I am, &c.,

J. RUSSELL.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 3, 1862, p. 2.]

No. 2.

Lord J. Russell to Lord Lyons.

FOREIGN OFFICE, May 6, 1861.

MY LORD: Her Majesty's government are disappointed in not having received from you, by the mail which has just arrived, any report of the state of affairs and of the prospects of the several parties, with reference to the issue of the struggle which appears unfortunately to have com-

* See dispatch of same date to Lord Lyons, *post*.

menced between them; but the interruption of the communication between Washington and New York sufficiently explains the non-arrival of your dispatches.

The account, however, which her Majesty's consuls at different ports were enabled to forward by the packet, coincide in showing that, whatever may be the final result of what cannot now be designated otherwise than as the civil war which has broken out between the several States of the late Union, for the present, at least, those States have separated into distinct confederacies, and, as such, are carrying on war against each other.

The question for neutral nations to consider is, what is the character of the war; and whether it should be regarded as a war carried on between parties severally in a position to wage war, and to claim the rights and to perform the obligations attaching to belligerents?

Her Majesty's government consider that that question can only be answered in the affirmative. If the government of the northern portion of the late Union possesses the advantages inherent in long-established governments, the government of the southern portion has, nevertheless, duly constituted itself, and carries on, in a regular form, the administration of the civil government of the States of which it is composed.

Her Majesty's government, therefore, without assuming to pronounce upon the merits of the question on which the respective parties are at issue, can do no less than accept the facts presented to them. They deeply deplore the disruption of a confederacy with which they have at all times sought to cultivate the most friendly relations; they view with the greatest apprehension and concern the misery and desolation in which that disruption threatens to involve the provinces now arrayed in arms against each other; but they feel that they cannot question the right of the southern States to claim to be recognized as a belligerent, and, as such, invested with all the rights and prerogatives of a belligerent.

I think it right to give your lordship this timely notice of the view taken by her Majesty's government of the present state of affairs in North America, and her Majesty's government do not wish you to make any mystery of that view.

I shall send your lordship, by an early opportunity, such further information on these matters as may be required for your guidance; at present, I have only to add that no expression of regret that you may employ at the present disastrous state of affairs will too strongly declare the feelings with which her Majesty's government contemplate all the evils which cannot fail to result from it.

I am, &c.,

J. RUSSELL.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 1, 1862, p. 23.]

No. 33.

Lord J. Russell to Lord Lyons.

FOREIGN OFFICE, May 11, 1861.

MY LORD: On Saturday last I received at my house Mr. Yancey, Mr. Mann, and Judge Rost, the three gentlemen deputed by the southern confederacy to obtain their recognition as an independent state. One of these gentlemen, speaking for the others, dilated on the causes which

had induced the southern States to secede from the northern. The principal of these causes, he said, was not slavery, but the very high price which, for the sake of protecting the northern manufacturers, the south were obliged to pay for the manufactured goods which they required. One of the first acts of the southern congress was to reduce these duties, and, to prove their sincerity, he gave as an instance that Louisiana had given up altogether that protection on her sugar which she enjoyed by the legislation of the United States.

As a proof of the riches of the south, he stated that of \$350,000,000 of exports of produce to foreign countries, \$270,000,000 were furnished by the southern States.

I said that I could hold no official communication with the delegates of the southern States. That, however, when the question of recognition came to be formally discussed, there were two points upon which inquiry must be made: first, whether the body seeking recognition could maintain its position as an independent state; secondly, in what manner it was proposed to maintain relations with foreign states.

After speaking at some length on the first of these points, and alluding to the news of the secession of Virginia and other intelligence favorable to their cause, these gentlemen called my attention to the article in their constitution prohibiting the slave trade.

I said that it was alleged very currently that if the slave States found that they could not compete successfully with the cotton of other countries they would revive the slave trade for the purpose of diminishing the cost of production. They said this was a suspicion unsupported by any proof. The fact was, that they had prohibited the slave trade, and did not mean to revive it. They pointed to the new tariff of the United States as a proof that British manufactures would be nearly excluded from the north, and freely admitted in the south.

Other observations were made, but not of very great importance. The delegates concluded by stating that they should remain in London for the present, in the hope that the recognition of the southern confederacy would not be long delayed.

I am, &c.,

J. RUSSELL.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extracts.]

No. 1.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,

London, May 17, 1861.

SIR: I have the satisfaction to announce my safe arrival at this place on Monday evening, the 13th of this month. The steamer reached Liverpool at eleven in the morning, where I was received with the utmost kindness, and strongly solicited to remain at least one day. A large deputation of the American Chamber of Commerce waited upon me and delivered an address, to which I made a brief reply. Both have been printed in the newspapers, and I transmit a copy of the Times containing them. I could not fail to observe, in the course of these proceedings, the great anxiety and the fluctuating sentiment that prevail in regard to the probable issue of affairs in America. I could also perceive that my arrival had been expected with far more solicitude than I had anticipated. It was not disguised from me that a supposed community of interest in the cotton culture was weighing heavily in that city in favor of the disaffected, and that much misapprehension prevailed as to the relative

position of parties in the United States, which it was of some consequence to dispel. To this end it had been the wish that I could have found it convenient to make a longer stay in the place.

Under other circumstances, I might have so far deferred to these representations as to delay my departure for twenty-four hours. But, on the other hand, some incidental allusions to the state of things in London convinced me of the importance of losing no time on my way. Accordingly, I took the next train in the afternoon, and was in a condition to proceed at once to business on the morning of Tuesday, the 14th. In the interval between my departure from Boston on the 1st and my arrival on the 14th, I discovered that some events had taken place deserving of attention. The agents of the so-called Confederate States had arrived, and, as it is supposed, through their instigation, certain inquiries and motions had been initiated in Parliament for the purpose of developing the views of the ministry in regard to American affairs. I allude more particularly to the questions proposed by Mr. Gregory, of Galway, and to the motion of Mr. Horsfall, the member for Liverpool, touching the effect of the blockade proclaimed by the President against the southern ports. The answer given by Lord John Russell, in the proceedings of the 6th of May, will, of course, have attracted your attention long before these lines meet your eye. I need not say that it excited general surprise, especially among those most friendly to the government of the United States. There seemed to be not a little precipitation in at once raising the disaffected States up to the level of a belligerent power, before it had developed a single one of the real elements which constitute military efficiency outside of its geographical limits. The case of the Greeks was by no means a parallel case, for the declaration had not been made until such time had intervened as was necessary to prove, by the very words quoted by Lord John Russell from the instructions of the British government, that the power was sufficient "to cover the sea with its cruisers." Whereas, in the present instance, there was no evidence to show, as yet, the existence of a single privateer afloat. The inference seemed almost inevitable, that there existed a disposition, at least, not to chill the hopes of those who are now drawing the very breath of life only from the expectation of sympathy in Great Britain. Yet, I am not quite prepared to say that there is just ground for the idea. On the contrary, I am led to believe, from the incidental discussion afterwards held in both houses, as well as from other information, that the language of Lord John Russell was viewed as not altogether sufficiently guarded, and that the ministry as a whole are not prepared to countenance any such conclusion.

There are still other reasons which occasion in me great surprise at the action of his lordship. I need not say that I was received by my predecessor, Mr. Dallas, with the greatest kindness and cordiality. I immediately learned from him that he had declined himself to enter into any discussions on the subject, because he knew that I was already on my way out, and that I should probably come fully possessed of the views of my government, and ready to communicate them freely to the authorities here. To this end, he had already concerted with Lord John Russell the earliest possible measures for my presentation and for a conference with him. * * On Tuesday morning Mr. Dallas called on me to accompany him on his visit to Lord John Russell, at his house, at eleven o'clock. Great was our disappointment, however, to find that he had been suddenly called away, at an early hour, to visit his brother, the Duke of Bedford, at Woburn Abbey, who was very ill, and who actually died at two o'clock in the afternoon of that day. This, of course, has put an end to all further communication with him for the present. I

very much regretted this circumstance, as I should have been glad to converse with him prior to the final action upon the proclamation which was adopted by the privy council, and which was issued in the Gazette on the very same day. A copy of that proclamation is to be found in the Times of the 15th of May, the same paper which I have already desired to transmit for another purpose. I submit it to your consideration without comment.

Feeling doubtful how the informal arrangement of Lord John Russell might have been affected by his sudden departure, I at once addressed to him the customary announcement of my arrival, and a request for an audience of her Majesty at an early day. This brought me immediate replies from the minister and from his secretary, Mr. Hammond, confirming the appointment of Thursday (yesterday) as the time for my presentation, whilst the latter gentleman notified me that in the absence of Lord John Russell, Lord Palmerston would be in waiting at the palace at three o'clock to present me. At the same time Mr. Dallas received a similar notification, appointing the same hour and place for his audience of leave. This arrangement was fully carried out yesterday according to the programme. Mr. Dallas was introduced first, and took his leave, after which I presented my credentials, with a few words expressive of the desire of my government to maintain the friendly relations existing between the two countries; and thus I became the recognized minister.

Thus an end is put to all the speculations which have been set afloat in some quarters, for interested purposes, touching the probable position of the minister of the United States at this court. I might add, that so far I have every reason to be fully satisfied with the reception which I have met with from everybody. Fortunately, the news which came from the United States by the same steamer which brought me was calculated to dispel many of the illusions that had been industriously elaborated during the period of isolation of the city of Washington, and to confirm the faith of those who had permitted themselves to doubt whether all government in the United States was of any more cohesiveness than a rope of sand. Yet, I cannot say that the public opinion is yet exactly what we would wish it. Much depends upon the course of things in the United States, and the firmness and energy made visible in the direction of affairs.

The morning papers contain a report of the debate in the House of Lords on the Queen's proclamation, to which I beg to call your particular attention. I cannot say that the tone of it is generally such as I could wish. There is undoubtedly a considerable influence at work here, both in and out of the ministry, which must be met and counteracted at as early a moment as practicable. Mr. Gregory yesterday gave notice of a postponement of the consideration of his motion until the 7th of June. The reason assigned is the situation of Lord John Russell. * * The same cause, however, which postpones this debate also delays my opportunities of conference with the minister. My wish has been to confer with him rather than with any of the subordinates, for reasons which will readily occur to you. Next week come the Whitsuntide holidays, and the adjournment of Parliament for ten days, during which little can be done with effect. I propose, nevertheless, at once to apply for a conference at as early a period as possible.

* * * * *

I have the honor to be your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

P. S.—I have this moment received your dispatches No. 3 and No. 4. They are of such importance that I immediately addressed a note to the foreign office requesting an early interview.

[For debate referred to see Parliamentary and Judicial Appendix, No. 2.]

Queen's Proclamation of May 13, 1861.

[From the London Times of May 15, 1861.]

[From Tuesday's Gazette.]

BY THE QUEEN.—A PROCLAMATION.

VICTORIA R.

Whereas we are happily at peace with all sovereigns, powers, and states:

And whereas hostilities have unhappily commenced between the government of the United States of America and certain States styling themselves the Confederate States of America:

And whereas we, being at peace with the government of the United States, have declared our royal determination to maintain a strict and impartial neutrality in the contest between the said contending parties:

We therefore have thought fit, by [and with] the advice of our privy council, to issue this our royal proclamation:

And we do hereby strictly charge and command all our loving-subjects to observe a strict neutrality in and during the aforesaid hostilities, and to abstain from violating or contravening either the laws and statutes of the realm in this behalf, or the law of nations in relation thereto, as they will answer to the contrary at their peril:

And whereas in and by a certain statute made and passed in the fifty-ninth year of his Majesty King George the Third, intituled "An act to prevent the enlisting or engagement of his Majesty's subjects to serve in a foreign service, and the fitting out or equipping, in his Majesty's dominions, vessels for warlike purposes, without his Majesty's license," it is, among other things, declared and enacted as follows:

"That if any natural born subject of his Majesty, his heirs and successors, without the leave or license of his Majesty, his heirs or successors, for that purpose first had and obtained, under the sign-manual of his Majesty, his heirs or successors, or signified by order in council, or by proclamation of his Majesty, his heirs or successors, shall take or accept, or shall agree to take or accept, any military commission, or shall otherwise enter into the military service, as a commissioned or non-commissioned officer, or shall enlist or enter himself to enlist, or shall agree to enlist or to enter himself to serve as a soldier, or to be employed or shall serve in any warlike or military operation in the service of or for or under or in aid of any foreign prince, state, potentate, colony, province, or part of any province or people, or of any person or persons exercising, or assuming to exercise, the powers of government in or over any foreign country, colony, province, or part of any province or people, either as an officer or soldier, or in any other military capacity; or if any natural-born subject of his Majesty shall, without such leave or license as aforesaid, accept, or agree to take or accept, any commission, warrant, or appointment as an officer, or shall enlist or enter himself, or shall agree to enlist or enter himself, to serve as a sailor or marine, or to

be employed, or engaged, or shall serve in and on board any ship or vessel of war, or in and on board any ship or vessel used or fitted out, or equipped or intended to be used for any warlike purpose, in the service of or for or under or in aid of any foreign power, prince, state, potentate, colony, province, or part of any province or people, or of any person or persons exercising, or assuming to exercise, the powers of government in or over any foreign country, colony, province, or part of any province or people; or if any natural-born subject of his Majesty shall, without such leave and license as aforesaid, engage, contract, or agree to go, or shall go to any foreign state, country, colony, province, or part of any province, or to any place beyond the seas, with an intent or in order to enlist or enter himself to serve, or with intent to serve, in any warlike or military operation whatever, whether by land or by sea, in the service of or for or under or in aid of any foreign prince, state, potentate, colony, province, or part of any province or people, or in the service of or under or in aid of any person or persons exercising, or assuming to exercise, the powers of government in or over any foreign country, colony, province, or part of any province or people, either as an officer or a soldier, or in any other military capacity, or as an officer or sailor, or marine, in any such ship or vessel as aforesaid, although no enlisting money or pay or reward shall have been or shall be in any or either of the cases aforesaid actually paid to or received by him, or by any person to or for his use or benefit; or if any person whatever, within the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, or in any part of his Majesty's dominions elsewhere, or in any country, colony, settlement, island, or place belonging to or subject to his Majesty, shall hire, retain, engage, or procure, or shall attempt or endeavor to hire, retain, engage, or procure, any person or persons whatever to enlist, or to enter or engage to enlist, or to serve or to be employed in any such service or employment as aforesaid, as an officer, soldier, sailor, or marine, either in land or sea service, for or under or in aid of any foreign prince, state, potentate, colony, province, or part of any province or people, or for or under or in aid of any person or persons exercising, or assuming to exercise, any powers of government as aforesaid, or to go or to agree to go or embark from any part of his Majesty's dominions, for the purpose or with intent to be so enlisted, entered, engaged, or employed as aforesaid, whether any enlisting money, pay, or reward shall have been or shall be actually given or received, or not; in any or either of such cases, every person so offending shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon being convicted thereof, upon any information or indictment, shall be punishable by fine and imprisonment, or either of them, at the discretion of the court before which such offender shall be convicted."

And it is in and by the said act further enacted—

"That if any person, within any part of the United Kingdom, or in any part of his Majesty's dominions beyond the seas, shall, without the leave and license of his Majesty for that purpose first had and obtained as aforesaid, equip, furnish, fit out, or arm, or attempt or endeavor to equip, furnish, fit out, or arm, or procure to be equipped, furnished, fitted out, or armed, or shall knowingly aid, assist, or be concerned in the equipping, furnishing, fitting out, or arming of any ship or vessel, with intent or in order that such ship or vessel shall be employed in the service of any foreign prince, state, or potentate, or of any foreign colony, province, or part of any province or people, or of any person or persons exercising, or assuming to exercise, any powers of government in or over any foreign state, colony, province, or part of any province or people, as a transport or store-ship, or with intent to cruise or commit hostilities

against any prince, state, or potentate, or against the subjects or citizens of any prince, state, or potentate, or against the persons exercising, or assuming to exercise, the powers of government in any colony, province, or part of any province or country, or against the inhabitants of any foreign colony, province, or part of any province or country, with whom his Majesty shall not then be at war; or shall, within the United Kingdom, or any of his Majesty's dominions, or in any settlement, colony, territory, island, or place belonging or subject to his Majesty, issue or deliver any commission for any ship or vessel, to the intent that such ship or vessel shall be employed as aforesaid, every such person so offending shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall, upon conviction thereof, upon any information or indictment, be punished by fine and imprisonment, or either of them, at the discretion of the court in which such offender shall be convicted; and every such ship or vessel, with the tackle, apparel and furniture, together with all the materials, arms, ammunition, and stores, which may belong to or be on board of any such ship or vessel, shall be forfeited; and it shall be lawful for any officer of his Majesty's customs or excise, or any officer of his Majesty's navy, who is by law empowered to make seizures for any forfeiture incurred under any of the laws of customs or excise, or the laws of trade and navigation, to seize such ships and vessels aforesaid, and in such places, and in such manner in which the officers of his Majesty's customs or excise and the officers of his Majesty's navy are empowered respectively to make seizures under the laws of customs and excise, or under the laws of trade and navigation; and that every such ship and vessel, with the tackle, apparel, and furniture, together with all the materials, arms, ammunition, and stores which may belong to or be on board of such ship or vessel, may be prosecuted and condemned in the like manner and in such courts as ships or vessels may be prosecuted and condemned for any breach of the laws made for the protection of the revenues of customs and excise, or of the laws of trade and navigation."

And it is in and by the said act further enacted—

"That if any person in any part of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, or in any part of his Majesty's dominions beyond the seas, without the leave and license of his Majesty for that purpose first had and obtained as aforesaid, shall, by adding to the number of the guns of such vessel, or by changing those on board for other guns, or by the addition of any equipment for war, increase or augment, or procure to be increased or augmented, or shall be knowingly concerned in increasing or augmenting, the warlike force of any ship or vessel of war, or cruiser, or other armed vessel, which at the time of her arrival in any part of the United Kingdom, or any of his Majesty's dominions, was a ship of war, cruiser, or armed vessel in the service of any foreign prince, state, or potentate, or of any person or persons exercising or assuming to exercise any powers of government in or over any colony, province, or part of any province or people belonging to the subjects of any such prince, state, or potentate, or to the inhabitants of any colony, province, or part of any province or country under the control of any person or persons so exercising, or assuming to exercise, the powers of government, every such person so offending shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall, upon being convicted thereof, upon any information or indictment, be punished by fine and imprisonment, or either of them, at the discretion of the court before which such offender shall be convicted."

Now, in order that none of our subjects may unwarily render themselves liable to the penalties imposed by the said statute, we do hereby

strictly command that no person or persons whosoever do commit any act, matter, or thing whatsoever, contrary to the provisions of the said statute, upon pain of the several penalties by the said statute imposed, and of our high displeasure.

And we do hereby further warn all our loving subjects, and all persons whatsoever entitled to our protection, that if any of them shall presume, in contempt of this our royal proclamation, and of our high displeasure, to do any acts in derogation of their duty, as subjects of a neutral sovereign in the said contest, or in violation or contravention of the law of nations in that behalf; as, for example, and more especially, by entering into the military service of either of the said contending parties, as commissioned or non-commissioned officers or soldiers; or by serving as officers, sailors, or marines on board any ship or vessel of war or transport of or in the service of either of the said contending parties; or by serving as officers, sailors, or marines on board any privateer bearing letters of marque of or from either of the said contending parties; or by engaging to go or going to any place beyond the seas with intent to enlist or engage in any such service, or by procuring or attempting to procure, within her Majesty's dominions at home or abroad, others to do so; or by fitting out, arming, or equipping any ship or vessel to be employed as a ship of war or privateer or transport by either of the said contending parties; or by breaking or endeavoring to break any blockade lawfully and actually established by or on behalf of either of the said contending parties; or by carrying officers, soldiers, dispatches, arms, military stores, or materials, or any article or articles considered and deemed to be contraband of war, according to the law or modern usage of nations, for the use or service of either of the said contending parties; all persons so offending will incur and be liable to the several penalties and penal consequences by the said statute or by the law of nations in that behalf imposed or denounced.

And we do hereby declare, that all our subjects and persons entitled to our protection, who may misconduct themselves in the premises, will do so at their peril and of their own wrong, and that they will in nowise obtain any protection from us against any liabilities or penal consequences, but will, on the contrary, incur our high displeasure by such misconduct.

Given at our court at the White Lodge, Richmond Park, this thirteenth day of May, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-one, and in the twenty-fourth year of our reign.

God save the Queen.

[The above has been compared with the proclamation as published in the British Blue Book, and the difference indicated by inclosing the words which appear in the Times, but not in the Blue Book, in brackets.]

[For subsequent proclamations and declarations of other powers, see General Appendix, No. 1.]

DECLARATION OF PARIS.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Circular.]

No. 3.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, April 24, 1861.

SIR: The advocates of benevolence, and the believers in human progress, encouraged by the slow though marked meliorations of the bar-

barities of war which have obtained in modern times, have been, as you are well aware, recently engaged with much assiduity in endeavoring to effect some modification of the law of nations in regard to the rights of neutrals in maritime war. In the spirit of the movement, the President of the United States, in the year 1854, submitted to the several maritime nations two propositions, to which he solicited their assent as permanent principles of international law, which were as follows:

1. Free ships make free goods; that is to say, that the effects or goods belonging to subjects or citizens of a power or state, at war, are free from capture or confiscation when found on board of neutral vessels, with the exception of articles contraband of war.

2. That the property of neutrals on board an enemy's vessel is not subject to confiscation unless the same be contraband of war.

Several of the governments to which these propositions were submitted expressed their willingness to accept them, while some others, which were then in a state of war, intimated a desire to defer acting thereon until the return of peace should present what they thought would be a more auspicious season for such interesting negotiations.

On the 16th of April, 1856, a congress was in session at Paris. It consisted of several maritime powers, represented by their plenipotentiaries, namely, Great Britain, Austria, France, Russia, Prussia, Sardinia and Turkey. That congress, having taken up the general subject to which allusion has already been made in this letter, on the day before mentioned, came to an agreement, which they adopted in the form of a declaration, to the effect following, namely:

1. Privateering is and remains abolished.

2. The neutral flag covers enemy's goods, with the exception of contraband of war.

3. Neutral goods, with the exception of contraband of war, are not liable to capture under enemy's flag.

4. Blockades, in order to be binding, must be effective; that is to say, maintained by forces sufficient really to prevent access to the coast of the enemy.

The agreement pledged the parties constituting the congress to bring the declaration thus made to the knowledge of the states which had not been represented in that body, and to invite them to accede to it. The congress, however, at the same time insisted, in the first place, that the declaration should be binding only on the powers who were or should become parties to it, as one whole and indivisible compact; and, secondly, that the parties who had agreed, and those who should afterwards accede to it, should, after the adoption of the same, enter into no arrangement on the application of maritime law in time of war without stipulating for a strict observance of the four points resolved by the declaration.

The declaration which I have thus substantially recited, of course, prevented all the powers which became parties to it from accepting the two propositions which have been before submitted to the maritime nations by the President of the United States.

The declaration was, in due time, submitted by the governments represented in the congress at Paris to the government of the United States.

The President, about the 14th of July, 1856, made known to the states concerned his unwillingness to accede to the declaration. In making that announcement on behalf of this government, my predecessor, Mr. Marcy, called the attention of those states to the following points, namely:

First. That the second and third propositions contained in the Paris

declaration are substantially the same with the two propositions which had before been submitted to the maritime states by the President.

Second. That the Paris declaration, with the conditions annexed, was inadmissible by the United States in three respects, namely: 1st. That the government of the United States could not give its assent to the first proposition contained in the declaration, namely, that "Privateering is and remains abolished," although it was willing to accept it with an amendment which should exempt the private property of individuals, though belonging to belligerent states, from seizure and confiscation by national vessels in maritime war. 2d. That for this reason the stipulation annexed to the declaration, viz.: that the four propositions must be taken altogether or rejected altogether, without modification, could not be allowed. 3d. That the farther condition annexed to the declaration, which provided that the parties acceding to it should enter into no negotiation for any modification of the law of maritime war with the nations, which should not contain the four points contained in the Paris declaration, seemed inconsistent with a proper regard to the national sovereignty of the United States.

On the 29th of July, 1856, Mr. Mason, then minister of the United States at Paris, was instructed by the President to propose to the government of France to enter into an arrangement for its adherence, with the United States, to the four principles of the declaration of the Congress of Paris, provided the first of them should be amended as specified in Mr. Marcy's note to the Count de Sartiges on the 28th of July, 1856. Mr. Mason accordingly brought the subject to the notice of the imperial government of France, which was disposed to entertain the matter favorably, but which failed to communicate its decision on the subject to him. Similar instructions regarding the matter were addressed by this department to Mr. Dallas, our minister at London, on the 31st day of January, 1857; but the proposition above referred to had not been directly presented to the British government by him when the administration of this government by Franklin Pierce, during whose term these proceedings occurred, came to an end on the 3d of March, 1857, and was succeeded by that of James Buchanan, who directed the negotiations to be arrested for the purpose of enabling him to examine the questions involved, and they have ever since remained in that state of suspension.

The President of the United States has now taken the subject into consideration, and he is prepared to communicate his views upon it, with a disposition to bring the negotiation to a speedy and satisfactory conclusion.

For that purpose, you are hereby instructed to seek an early opportunity to call the attention of her Majesty's government to the subject, and to ascertain whether it remains disposed to renew negotiations for the accession of the government of the United States to the declaration of the Paris congress, with the conditions annexed by that body to the same; and if you shall find that government so disposed, you will then enter into a convention to that effect, substantially in the form of a project for that purpose herewith transmitted to you; the convention to take effect from the time when the due ratifications of the same shall have been exchanged. It is presumed that you will need no special explanation of the sentiments of the President on this subject for the purpose of conducting the necessary conferences with the government to which you are accredited. Its assent is expected on the ground that the proposition is accepted at its suggestion, and in the form it has proposed. For your own information, it will be sufficient to say that the President adheres to the opinion expressed by my predecessor, Mr.

Marcy, that it would be eminently desirable for the good of all nations that the property and effects of private individuals, not contraband, should be exempt from seizure and confiscation by national vessels in maritime war. If the time and circumstances were propitious to a prosecution of the negotiation with that object in view, he would direct that it should be assiduously pursued. But the right season seems to have passed, at least for the present. Europe seems once more on the verge of quite general wars. On the other hand, a portion of the American people have raised the standard of insurrection, and proclaimed a provisional government, and, through its organs, have taken the bad resolution to invite privateers to prey upon the peaceful commerce of the United States.

Prudence and humanity combine in persuading the President, under the circumstances, that it is wise to secure the lesser good offered by the Paris congress, without waiting indefinitely in hope to obtain the greater one offered to the maritime nations by the President of the United States.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

P. S.—A full power to treat is also herewith sent. The same, *mutatis mutandis*, to the ministers of the United States in France, Russia, Prussia, Austria, Belgium, Italy, and Denmark.

Convention upon the subject of the rights of belligerents and neutrals in time of war, between the United States of America and her Majesty the Queen of Great Britain and Ireland.

The United States of America and her Majesty the Queen of Great Britain and Ireland, being equally animated by a desire to define with more precision the rights of belligerents and neutrals in time of war, have, for that purpose, conferred full powers, the President of the United States upon Charles Francis Adams, accredited as their envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to her said Majesty, and her Majesty the Queen of Great Britain and Ireland, upon—

And the said plenipotentiaries, after having exchanged their full powers, have concluded the following articles :

ARTICLE I.

1. Privateering is and remains abolished. 2. The neutral flag covers enemy's goods, with the exception of contraband of war. 3. Neutral goods, with the exception of contraband of war, are not liable to capture under enemy's flag. 4. Blockades, in order to be binding, must be effective; that is to say, maintained by a force sufficient really to prevent access to the coast of the enemy.

ARTICLE II.

The present convention shall be ratified by the President of the United States of America, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and by her Majesty the Queen of Great Britain and Ireland, and the ratifications shall be exchanged at Washington, within the space of six

months from the signature, or sooner if possible. In faith whereof, the respective plenipotentiaries have signed the present convention in duplicate, and have thereto affixed their seals.

Done at London, the — day of —, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-one, (1861.)

[Communicated to Lord J. Russell by Mr. Adams, July 13.]

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 3, 1862, p. 1.]

No. 1.

Lord J. Russell to Earl Cowley.

FOREIGN OFFICE, May 6, 1861.

MY LORD: Although her Majesty's government have received no dispatches from Lord Lyons by the mail which has just arrived, the communication between Washington and New York being interrupted, yet the accounts which have reached them from some of her Majesty's consuls, coupled with what has appeared in the public prints, are sufficient to show that a civil war has broken out among the States which lately composed the American Union.

Other nations have, therefore, to consider the light in which, with reference to that war, they are to regard the confederacy into which the southern States have united themselves; and it appears to her Majesty's government that, looking at all the circumstances of the case, they cannot hesitate to admit that such confederacy is entitled to be considered as a belligerent, and, as such, invested with all the rights and prerogatives of a belligerent.

I have stated this to Lord Lyons in the dispatch of which I inclose a copy for your excellency's information.*

In making known to M. Thouvenel the opinion of her Majesty's government on this point, your excellency will add that you are instructed to call the attention of the French government to the bearing which this unfortunate contest threatens to have on the rights and interests of neutral nations.

On the one hand, President Lincoln, in behalf of the northern portion of the late United States, has issued a proclamation declaratory of an intention to subject the ports of the southern portion of the late Union to a rigorous blockade; on the other hand, President Davis, on behalf of the southern portion of the late Union, has issued a proclamation declaratory of an intention to grant letters of marque for cruisers to be employed against the commerce of the north.

In this state of things, it appears to her Majesty's government to be well deserving of the immediate consideration of all maritime powers, but more especially of France and England, whether they should not take some steps to invite the contending parties to act upon the principles laid down in the second and third articles of the declaration of Paris of 1856, which relates to the security of neutral property on the high seas.

The United States, as an entire government, have not acceded to that declaration; but in practice they have, in their conventions with other powers, adopted the second article, although admitting that, without some such convention, the rule was not one of universal application.

* This dispatch is printed with the above under the head of "Belligerent Recognition."

As regards the third article, in recent treaties concluded by the United States with South American republics, the principle adopted has been at variance with that laid down in the declaration of Paris.

Your excellency will remember that when it was proposed to the government of the United States, in 1856, to adopt the whole of the declaration of Paris, they, in the first instance, agreed to the second, third, and fourth proposals, but made a condition as to the first that the other powers should assent to extending the declaration so as to exempt all private property whatever from capture on the high seas; but before any final decision was taken on this proposal, the government of President Buchanan, which in the interval had come into power, withdrew the proposition altogether.

It seems to her Majesty's government to be deserving of consideration whether a joint endeavor should not now be made to obtain from each of the belligerents a formal recognition of both principles as laid down in the declaration of Paris, so that such principles shall be admitted by both, as they have been admitted by the powers who made or acceded to the declaration of Paris, henceforth to form part of the general law of nations.

Her Majesty's government would be glad to be made acquainted with the views of the imperial government on this matter with as little delay as possible.

I am, &c.,

J. RUSSELL.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 3, p. 3.]

No. 3.

Earl Cowley to Lord J. Russell.

PARIS, May 9, 1861.

MY LORD: I called this afternoon on M. Thouvenel for the purpose of obtaining his answer to the proposals contained in your lordship's dispatch of the 6th instant, relative to the measures which should be pursued by the maritime powers of Europe for the protection of neutral property in presence of the events which are passing in the American States.

M. Thouvenel said the imperial government concurred entirely in the views of her Majesty's government, and would be prepared to join her Majesty's government in endeavoring to obtain of the belligerents a formal recognition of the second and third articles of the declaration of Paris. M. de Flahault would receive instructions to make this known officially to your lordship.

With regard to the manner in which this endeavor should be made, M. Thouvenel said that he thought a communication should be addressed to both parties in as nearly as possible the same language, the consuls being made the organs of communication with the southern States; that the language employed should be that of goodwill and friendship; that the present state of things should be deplored, and a declaration made that the governments of Great Britain and France intended to abstain from all interference; but that the commercial interests of the two countries demanded that they should be assured that the principles with respect to neutral property laid down by the congress of Paris would be adhered to, an assurance which the two governments did not doubt they should obtain, as the principles in question were in strict accordance with those that had been always advocated by the United States.

M. Thouvenel observed that as France and the United States had been always agreed on these maritime questions, it would be difficult for either party in America to refuse their assent to the principles now invoked.

His excellency said further that, in looking for precedents, it had been discovered that Great Britain, although treating at the commencement of the American war letters of marque as piracy, had, after a time, recognized the belligerent rights of the States in rebellion against her.

I have, &c.,

COWLEY.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 3, 1862, p. 3.]

No. 4.

Lord John Russell to Earl Cowley.

FOREIGN OFFICE,
May 13, 1861.

MY LORD: I have received your excellency's dispatch of the 9th instant, and I have to instruct you to express to M. Thouvenel the satisfaction of her Majesty's government at the concurrence of the imperial government in their views, as set forth in my dispatch of the 6th instant, in regard to the expediency of endeavoring to obtain from the belligerent States of North America a formal recognition of the second and third articles of the declaration of Paris on the subject of maritime law.

I am, &c.,

J. RUSSELL.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 3, 1862, p. 3.]

No. 5.

Lord J. Russell to Earl Cowley.

[Extract.]

FOREIGN OFFICE, May 16, 1861.

I transmit to your excellency herewith a copy of a draft to Lord Lyons.*

Your excellency will communicate the draft to M. Thouvenel, and report to me, as soon as possible, whether the French government concur in it; in which case the instruction would be forwarded to Lord Lyons by the mail of Saturday next.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 3, 1862, p. 4.]

No. 6.

Earl Cowley to Lord J. Russell.

[Extract.]

PARIS, May 17, 1861.

I saw M. Thouvenel as soon as was possible after the receipt of your lordship's dispatch of yesterday's date, inclosing a copy of a draft to Lord Lyons.

* Printed with dispatch No. 39 of Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward, dated September 7, 1861.

M. Thouvenel had already written to M. Mercier in the same terms as your lordship proposes to address your instructions to Lord Lyons. I need hardly add that his excellency concurs entirely in the draft.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 3, 1862, p. 6.]

No. 8.

Lord J. Russell to Lord Lyons.

[Extract.]

FOREIGN OFFICE, May 18, 1861.

I think it right to acquaint your lordship that my instruction to you of the sixth instant, in which I stated to you the grounds on which her Majesty's government had thought it incumbent on them to admit the belligerent rights of the Confederate States of America, as well as my instruction to you of this day, have severally been communicated to the French government, and that, as I learn from Lord Cowley and the French ambassador, the imperial government concur in those instructions, and have sent corresponding instructions to M. Mercier.

Your lordship may therefore be prepared to find your French colleague ready to take the same line with yourself in his communications with the government of the United States.

I need not tell your lordship that her Majesty's government would very gladly see a practice which is calculated to lead to great irregularities, and to increase the calamities of war, renounced by both the contending parties in America as it has been renounced by almost every other nation of the world; and therefore you will not err in encouraging the government to which you are accredited to carry into effect any disposition which they may evince to recognize the declaration of Paris in regard to privateering, as her Majesty's government do not doubt that they will, without hesitation, recognize the remaining articles of the declaration, to which you are now instructed to call their attention.

You will clearly understand that her Majesty's government cannot accept the renunciation of privateering on the part of the government of the United States if coupled with the condition that they should enforce its renunciation on the Confederate States, either by denying their right to issue letters of marque, or by interfering with the belligerent operations of vessels holding from them such letters of marque, so long as they carry on hostilities according to the recognized principles and under the admitted liabilities of the law of nations.

You will take such means as you shall judge most expedient to transmit to her Majesty's consul at Charleston or New Orleans a copy of my previous dispatch to you of this day's date, to be communicated at Montgomery to the president of the so-styled Confederate States.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 10.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 21, 1861.

SIR:

As to the treatment of privateers in the insurgent service, you will

say that this is a question exclusively our own. We treat them as pirates. They are our own citizens, or persons employed by our citizens, preying on the commerce of our country. If Great Britain shall choose to recognize them as lawful belligerents, and give them shelter from our pursuit and punishment, the law of nations afford an adequate and proper remedy and we shall avail ourselves of it.

Happily, however, her Britannic Majesty's government can avoid all these difficulties. It invited us in 1856 to accede to the declaration of the congress of Paris, of which body Great Britain was herself a member, abolishing privateering everywhere in all cases and forever. You already have our authority to propose to her our accession to that declaration. If she refuse to receive it, it can only be because she is willing to become the patron of privateering when aimed at our devastation.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 2.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, May 21, 1861.

SIR:

I then remarked [to Lord John Russell] that there was another subject upon which I had received a dispatch, though I should not, after so long a conference, venture to do more than open the matter to-day. This was a proposal to negotiate in regard to the rights of neutrals in time of war. The necessary powers had been transmitted to me, together with the form of a convention, which I would do myself the honor to submit to his consideration if there was any disposition to pursue the matter further. His lordship then briefly reviewed the past action of the two countries since the meeting of the congress at Paris, and expressed the willingness of Great Britain to negotiate; but he seemed to desire to leave the subject in the hands of Lord Lyons, to whom he intimated that he had already transmitted authority to assent to any modification of the only point in issue which the government of the United States might prefer. On that matter he believed there would be no difficulty whatever. Under these circumstances, I shall not press the subject further at this place until I receive new directions to that effect from the department.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," 1862, No. 3. p. 6.]

No. 9.

Lord J. Russell to Lord Lyons.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *May 21, 1861.*

MY LORD: In the course of our conversation on the 18th, Mr. Adams told me that his government was disposed to adhere to the provisions of

the declaration of Paris, and that he had powers to negotiate upon that question. But upon my saying that both Great Britain and France had given instructions to their ministers at Washington upon this subject, he said he thought it would be well not to pursue the matter here, but to leave it in the hands of the Secretary of State.

I am, &c.,

J. RUSSELL.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 5.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, May 22, 1861.

SIR: * * * * *

I have opened, since here, (directed to my predecessor,) a copy of the President's proclamation as to the blockade of the ports of Virginia and North Carolina, dated 27th April, 1861. I received likewise dispatch No. 4 last night, containing views of the government at Washington as to the abolition of privateering, and inclosing to me a commission to effect with the French government a treaty for that purpose, with the form of such treaty. This is of great importance, and will affect in a material degree the means of defense on the part of our country in time of war. I shall proceed in conformity, however, with these instructions, to communicate with the minister of foreign affairs on the subject. But I cannot help feeling that, in view of what the French law is, as heretofore stated, and the little danger to our commerce which can soon arise from any action of this government or of its subjects from privateers, that I had better attempt again to obtain a provision exempting from seizure *private* property afloat (unless contraband) the same as private property is now exempt on land. I should very much regret an opportunity lost to obtain such a treaty provision, if possible, before we give up that species of volunteer marine by which we are enabled in some degree to affect the commerce of other nations, having a heavier naval marine, while they are destroying our own. The Emperor is about to leave Paris for the country, and it is doubtful if great expedition can be had in this matter; but, acting under the direct instructions of the government at home, I shall incur no unnecessary delay in carrying those instructions (if I can procure no better terms) into effect.

* * * * *

Your very obedient servant,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON. •

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 6.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, May 27, 1861.

SIR: Immediately after closing my last dispatch I wrote to Mr. Thouvenel a note apprising him that I was fully authorized to enter into a

convention with the government of France in respect to privateering, the rights of neutrals, and the matter of blockade, and requesting him, if disposed to renew negotiations upon these subjects, to name a day for conference.

My note was not sent until the 25th instant. A copy is attached, marked letter A.

* * * * *
With much consideration, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

—
A.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Thouvenel.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, May 24, 1861.

SIR: I have the honor to inform your excellency that I am fully authorized by my government to enter into a convention with the government of France in reference to the subject of privateering, the rights of neutrals, and the matter of blockade.

If, therefore, the government of his Imperial Majesty remains disposed to renew negotiations upon these subjects, I shall be happy to have a conference with your excellency at such time as your excellency may indicate.

With great respect, I have the honor to be your obedient servant,
WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

M. THOUVENEL,
Minister of Foreign Affairs,

—
Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

[Extracts.]

No. 8.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, May 30, 1861.

SIR: Since the date of my dispatch No. 6 I have had an interview with Mr. Thouvenel.

I told him I was authorized to accept the four propositions adopted at the congress of Paris in 1856, but with the desire expressed by the President that the provisions should be added exempting private property afloat, unless contraband, from seizure and confiscation. I did not say, nor did he ask, whether the four propositions would be accepted without amendment. He said nothing could be done except by conference with the other powers, but if I would submit the proposition in writing, which I shall at once do, he would immediately address the other powers, and we would probably receive an answer in ten or twelve days.

I have been induced to suggest again the adoption of this amendment exempting private property afloat from seizure and confiscation: (1.) From the preference or wish of the President expressed in your letter of instruction. (2.) From the great importance, as it seemed to me, of

securing the adoption of the principle, if possible, before the United States should give up the right of privateering. (3.) From the facts patent on the correspondence of this legation in 1856, whereby it appears that France and Russia were both favorably disposed at that time to the adoption of the principle of the amendment, (see Mr. Marcy's dispatch to Mr. Mason, No. 94, dated October 4, 1856, and Mr. Mason's confidential letter to Mr. Dallas, of December 6, 1856,) and the obvious fact that it would be the interest of all the other powers (having little naval force) to concur in the amendment. (4.) From the fact that since the date of your dispatch to me authorizing the acceptance of the four propositions adopted by the congress at Paris, Mr. Sanford, our minister to Belgium, on a visit to England, learned from Mr. Adams that the British government had given, as he understood, general instructions on the subject to Lord Lyons; and the impression made on the mind of Mr. Adams, as reported to me by Mr. Sanford, was that it was not improbable that England would now, to secure our concurrence in the other propositions, concur in the amendment. That in view of this information, Mr. Adams, who had like instructions with my own, had referred the matter back to be treated of and discussed at Washington. I could not, therefore, at once accept the four propositions, pure and simple, without running the hazard of conflicting with what might be done elsewhere.

I will probably receive an answer from Mr. Thouvenel (after he shall have communicated my proposition to the other powers) before even I shall receive my next dispatch on this subject from Washington, which I shall await with some anxiety.

The laws, however, in connection with the practice of the tribunals of France are, I think, as follows:

1. That the captain who accepts a commission from a foreign government and takes command of a cruiser is guilty of a piratical act.
2. That all French subjects enlisting on board of such cruiser, without authority of the Emperor, lose their citizenship, and consequently forfeit their right to the protection of their government.
3. That the principle applied in the French tribunals is unlike that which has been applied in England (and I fear it will be found in the United States) as to harboring privateers; and while their prizes are in a neutral port having them condemned in courts of admiralty of the country licensing such privateer. The laws and practice of the French courts do not admit of this. But these matters, as Mr. Thouvenel now says, must be all left for determination to the tribunals of France.

With high consideration, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

[From the British Blue Book, "North America," No. 3, p. 8.]

No. 12.

Lord Lyons to Lord J. Russell.

[Extract.]

WASHINGTON, June 4, 1861.

I had, the day before yesterday, the honor to receive your lordship's dispatches, dated the 18th ultimo, directing me to make proposals to the

government of the United States to adhere to the principles respecting maritime law laid down by the congress of Paris.

M. Mercier, the French minister here, received on the same day instructions from M. Thouvenel to concert measures with me, with a view to making the same proposals on the part of the French government.

M. Mercier had also received instructions to direct the French consul at New Orleans to go to Montgomery, to make similar proposals to President Davis.

M. Mercier and I had a conversation respecting these instructions a few hours after the dispatches containing them reached us.

On one point we both entirely agreed. We were both convinced that the best hope of attaining the object of our instructions, and of preventing an inconvenient outbreak from this government, lay in making the course of Great Britain and France as nearly as possible identical.

It is probable that Mr. Adams may, before this dispatch reaches your lordship, have offered, on the part of this government, to adhere to article 1 of the declaration of Paris, as well as to the others, and thus to declare privateering to be abolished. There is no doubt that this adherence will be offered in the expectation that it will bind the governments accepting it to treat the privateers of the southern confederacy as pirates. Had this government offered its adherence immediately upon the appearance of the notice by the southern confederacy of its intention to issue letters of marque, it would probably have not been very difficult for Great Britain and France to have exercised an influence at Montgomery which would have prevented the letters from being actually issued. At the present moment, however, the privateers are in full activity, and have met with considerable success. It is not, therefore, to be expected that the southern confederacy will relinquish the employment of them, otherwise than on compulsion or in return for some great concession from France and England.

It seems to be far from certain that the United States Congress would ratify the abolition of privateering; nor do I suppose that the cabinet will abide by its proposal when it finds that it will gain nothing towards the suppression of the southern privateering by doing so.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

[Extracts.]

No. 9.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, June 7, 1861.

SIR: * * * * *

I understood him (M. Thouvenel) to say an answer could be got within ten or twelve days from the other powers. I was surprised at the briefness of the time stated, but supposed he meant to consult the representatives of those powers at this court; but his remark, as I am now informed, applied to a consultation with certain of the ministers of the French government only. The statement in the American newspapers, that the Department of State had authorized an acceptance of the Paris treaty of 1856 (if that is understood by Lord Lyons to be a distinct acceptance of the treaty, pure and simple) will, I fear, prevent all chance of other terms. The late annunciation of the course of the British government, shutting their ports against privateers, (which so much limits the belligerent rights of the so-called Confederate States,) you will con-

sider, perhaps, renders the accession of our government to the treaty of Paris at this time of less importance than it otherwise would be. I think, from remarks in the New York press, (Herald and Times, and perhaps other prints which I have not seen,) that the force and efficacy of an accession by our government to the treaty of Paris is misunderstood. If I understand the view of these foreign governments, such accession by us would merely bind our hands as respects privateering; it would not at all enlarge our rights as against a belligerent power *not a party* to the treaty; nor would it bind these European governments to enforce the laws of piracy as against such belligerent power *not a party to the treaty*. If they admit the Confederate States as a belligerent power, and recognize them for even commercial purposes, (which, I take it, is what they mean to do,) our accession to the treaty of Paris will not change their action on this question. The status of these rebellious States as respects privateering will remain where it was; at least that is the view which I think is and will be taken of this question by England and France. But however this may be, I am happy to know that, in suggesting to the French government the amendment to that treaty, (securing private property afloat, unless contraband,) I have occasioned no unnecessary delay, inasmuch as Mr. Adams has referred the whole matter back to Washington, and as soon as you shall act there, or before, upon a notification to me, I can act here.

With high consideration, I have the honor to be your obedient servant,
 WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

[Extracts.]

No. 10.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, June 12, 1861.

SIR: *

I have not yet received from Mr. Thouvenel an answer to my written proposition to open negotiations for the accession of the United States to the treaty of Paris of 1856. A copy of that written proposition, marked A, is herewith attached.

The European press, so far as I have observed, take it for granted that the accession of the United States to that treaty would not at all alter the relations of the several powers to the so-called southern confederacy. A treaty cannot of itself alter the law of nations, although it may restrict the rights of those States which become parties to it. The treaty of Paris certainly did not prevent the United States, while no party to it, from issuing letters of marque, nor would the accession of the United States to such treaty prevent the confederates of the South from doing the same thing if they are recognized by other nations as a belligerent power. The whole difficulty, every subsequent right which has been conceded to the confederates, grows out of that recognition.

It is doubtful, perhaps, whether the other powers will, under the circumstances, negotiate for the accession of the United States at this time to the treaty in question; but should they do so, it will be with the understanding, I take it, that it imposes no new duties upon them grow-

ing out of our domestic controversy. I beg pardon, however, for these suggestions. They may, perhaps, be considered a little beyond the line of my official duties.

With high consideration, I have the honor to be your obedient servant,
WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. **WILLIAM H. SEWARD,**
Secretary of State.

A.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Thouvenel.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, May 31, 1861.

SIR: In conformity with the verbal promise I gave at our last conference, I now have the honor to propose to your excellency an accession, on the part of the United States of America, to "the declaration concerning maritime law," adopted by the plenipotentiaries of France, Great Britain, Austria, Prussia, Russia, Sardinia, and Turkey, at Paris, on the 16th of April, 1856, with the addition to the first clause, which declares "privateering is and remains abolished," of the following words: "And the private property of the subjects or citizens of a belligerent on the high seas shall be exempted from seizure by public armed vessels of the other belligerent, unless it be contraband."

Thus amended I will immediately sign a convention on the part of the United States, acceding to the declaration, which will, I doubt not, be promptly ratified and confirmed by my government.

With much respect, I have the honor to be your very obedient servant,
WM. L. DAYTON.

His Excellency Monsieur **THOUVENEL,**
Minister of Foreign Affairs.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 3, p. 7.]

No. 10.

Lord J. Russell to Mr. Grey.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *June 12, 1861.*

SIR: The ambassador of France came to me yesterday, and informed me that the minister of the United States at Paris had made to M. Thouvenel two propositions:

The first was that France should agree to add to the 1st article of the declaration of Paris the plan of protecting private property on the sea from capture in time of war.

The second proposition was, that privateering being abolished by the adoption of the 1st article of the declaration of Paris, amended as proposed, the privateers sent out by the so-styled southern confederacy should be considered as pirates.

M. Thouvenel wishes to learn the opinions of her Majesty's government

upon these propositions. Her Majesty's government decidedly object to the first proposition. It seems to them that it would reduce the power in time of war of all States having a military as well as a commercial marine.

It is hardly necessary to point out that in practice it would be almost impossible to distinguish between *bona fide* ships carrying merchandise, and ships fraudulently fitted out with means of war under the guise of merchant vessels.

With regard to the second point, her Majesty's government are not disposed to depart from the neutral character which her Majesty, as well as the Emperor of the French, has assumed.

You will read this dispatch to M. Thouvenel.

I am, &c.,

J. RUSSELL.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 8.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, June 14, 1861.

SIR:

However this may be, my duty was plain. I applied for an interview with Lord John Russell, and he appointed one for ten o'clock on Wednesday, the 12th, at his own house. After some slight preliminary talk, I observed to him that I had been instructed to press upon her Majesty's government the expediency of early action on the subject of privateering; that in the present state of excitement in the United States consequent upon the measures which it had felt it necessary to adopt, I did not know of anything which would be so likely to allay it as an agreement on this point. His lordship then said that he did not know whether I knew it, but the fact was that Mr. Dayton had made a proposition to France for negotiation on the basis of the articles as agreed upon in Paris. France had communicated the fact through her minister, the Comte de Flahault; and he intimated that there had been a cabinet conversation on the subject, without arriving at a decision. I then referred to what had passed at our former interview. I mentioned my proposal to negotiate, and the inclination shown by his lordship to leave the subject with Lord Lyons, with authority to arrange the only point in dispute as the government at Washington might desire. There I had left the matter. His lordship replied that he did not mean to be quite so understood. His intention was to say, that having agreed upon the three articles, he should be ready to consent to the total omission of the fourth article, if that would be agreeable at Washington. I said that I had not so understood him, and from my present recollection I am confident that my report of his language was not incorrect.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 3, 1862, p. 7.]

No. 11.

Mr. Grey to Lord J. Russell.

PARIS, June 14, 1861.

MY LORD: In obedience to your lordship's instructions, I yesterday read to M. Thouvenel your dispatch of the 12th instant, relating to the propositions made by the minister of the United States to his excellency.

M. Thouvenel expressed great satisfaction on finding how completely your lordship's views coincided with his own. His excellency said he was already aware that your lordship entertained the same opinion as he himself did on this subject, but he had not yet heard it so decidedly expressed, and he desired me to convey his thanks to your lordship for the communication.

His excellency proceeded to say that the first proposition had not been made by Mr. Dayton until he had asked that minister to address him an official note on the subject. His answer to it was that the imperial government would be glad if that of the United States acceded, "purely and simply," to the declaration of Paris, but that it was out of the question to accept the condition which it was proposed to add to that declaration, for the effect would be, as your lordship observes, greatly to reduce the power in time of war of all states having a military as well as a commercial marine. With regard to the second proposition, his excellency said it was made by the United States, with the evident object of leading the French government to take a decided part against the southern confederacy, but this attempt had failed, and there was no intention on the part of the French government to depart from their neutral character.

M. Thouvenel also informed me that he has not yet received any further communication from Mr. Dayton.

I have, &c.,

W. G. GREY.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

[Extracts.]

No. 10.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 17, 1861.

SIR: * * * * *

The United States have never disclaimed the employment of letters of marque as a means of maritime war. The insurgents early announced their intention to commission privateers. We knew that friendly nations would be anxious for guarantees of safety from injury by that form of depredation upon the national commerce. We knew also that such nations would desire to be informed whether their flags should be regarded as protecting goods, not contraband of war, of disloyal citizens, found under them, and whether the goods, not contraband, of subjects of such nations would be safe from confiscation when found in vessels of disloyal citizens of the United States. This administration, free from some of the complications of those which had preceded it, promptly took up the negotiations relating to the declaration of the congress of

Paris, just at the point where they had been suspended by President Buchanan. We found it just and humane in itself, so far as it goes, and that it had only failed to be accepted by the United States because foreign nations had refused to accept an additional principle proposed by this government, yet more just and humane than any which it does contain, namely, that the property of private citizens, not contraband, should be exempted from confiscation in maritime war. While still willing and desirous to have that further principle incorporated in the law of nations, we nevertheless instructed you, and all our other representatives in foreign countries, to waive it, if necessary, and to stipulate, subject to the concurrence of the Senate of the United States, our adhesion to the declaration of the congress of Paris as a whole and unmodified. This was done so early as the 25th day of April last, long before the date of the instructions which Mr. Mercier proposed to submit to us. We have ever since that time been waiting for the responses of foreign powers to this high and liberal demonstration on our part. We have, however, received no decisive answers on the subject from those powers.

It was under these circumstances that, on the 15th day of June instant, the minister from France and the minister from Great Britain, having previously requested an interview, were received by me. Each of them announced that he was charged by his government to read a dispatch to me and to give me a copy if I should desire it. I answered that, owing to the peculiar circumstances of the time, I could not consent to an official reading or delivery of these papers without first knowing their characters and objects. They confidentially and with entire frankness put the dispatches into my hands for an informal preliminary examination. Having thus become possessed of their characters, I replied to those ministers that I could not allow them to be officially communicated to this government. They will doubtless mention this answer to their respective states.

* * * * *

The paper, as understood, while implying a disposition on the part of France to accord belligerent rights to the insurgents, does not name, specify, or even indicate, one such belligerent right. On the other hand, the rights which it asserts that France expects, as a neutral, from the United States, as a belligerent, are even less than this government, on the 25th of April, instructed you to concede and guarantee to her by treaty, as a friend. On that day we offered to her our adhesion to the declaration of Paris, which contains four propositions, namely: 1st. That privateering shall be abolished. 2d. That a neutral flag covers enemy's goods not contraband of war. 3d. That goods of a neutral, not contraband, shall not be confiscated, though found in an enemy's vessel. 4th. That blockades, in order to be lawful, must be maintained by competent force. We have always, when at war, conceded the three last of these rights to neutrals, *a fortiori*, we could not when at peace deny them to friendly nations. The first-named concession was proposed on the grounds already mentioned. We are still ready to guarantee these rights, by convention with France, whenever she shall authorize either you or her minister here to enter into convention. There is no reservation or difficulty about their application in the present case. We hold all the citizens of the United States, loyal or disloyal, alike included by the law of nations and treaties; and we hold ourselves bound by the same obligations to see, so far as may be in our power, that all our citizens, whether maintaining this government or engaged in overthrowing it, respect those rights in favor of France and of every other friendly nation. In any case, not only shall we allow no privateer or national

vessel to violate the rights of friendly nations, as I have thus described them, but we shall also employ all our naval force to prevent the insurgents from violating them, just as much as we do to prevent them from violating the laws of our own country.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 3, 1862, p. 9.]

No. 14.

Lord Lyons to Lord J. Russell.

[Extract.]

WASHINGTON, June 17, 1861.

After maturely considering what would be the most conciliatory form in which we could execute the instructions which we had received respecting the maritime rights resulting from the position of Great Britain and France as neutrals between the contending parties in this country, M. Mercier and I waited together upon Mr. Seward at the State Department the day before yesterday.

I began the conversation by observing to Mr. Seward that the conversations which he had recently held with M. Mercier had no doubt made him sufficiently acquainted with the nature of the communication which we were instructed to make to him. We had come to consult him frankly on the subject, and we should be really obliged if he would tell us in what form it would suit him best that the communication should be made.

Mr. Seward said at once that he could not receive from us a communication founded on the assumption that the southern rebels were to be regarded as belligerents; that this was a determination to which the cabinet had come deliberately; that he could not admit that recent events had in any respect altered the relations between foreign powers and the southern States; that he would not discuss the question with us, but that he should give instructions to the United States ministers in London and Paris, who would be thus enabled to state the reasons for the course taken by their government to your lordship and to M. Thouvenel, if you should be desirous to hear them.

"That is to say," observed M. Mercier, "you prefer to treat the question in Paris and London rather than with us here."

"Just so," said Mr. Seward; and he proceeded to tell us that he should be very much obliged if we would, on our side, leave with him, for his own use only, our instructions, in order that he might be able to write his dispatches to London and Paris with a certainty that he did not misapprehend the views of our governments.

In compliance with this request, M. Mercier gave to Mr. Seward M. Thouvenel's dispatch of the 11th of May; and I placed in his hands your lordship's dispatch to me of the 18th ultimo.

Mr. Seward proceeded, in a friendly and less formal tone, to say that he did not relish the identity of the course pursued by Great Britain and France; that he did not think that two European powers ought to consult together upon the course to be pursued towards a great nation like

the United States, and announce that they were acting in concert on the subject.

M. Mercier and I endeavored to make it clear to Mr. Seward that this was a susceptibility which was not indulged in by the great powers of Europe in their relations with each other. Nothing, we said, was more common than for two or more powers to come to an agreement upon the policy to be pursued on a matter in which they had a common interest, and to unite their efforts in order to give effect to that policy. Such a course was never considered offensive or disrespectful. Certainly on the present occasion Great Britain and France had none but the most friendly feelings towards the United States.

Mr. Seward replied that he could not but notice this point, although he did not mean to make it the subject of a formal complaint.

As to what the British and French governments practically asked, he was, he said, perfectly ready to agree to all, and more than all, that was desired. The United States had always held, and held still, that the flag covered the cargo, and that the property of a friend was not liable to seizure under an enemy's flag. The government admitted fully that it would be responsible for the acts of any privateer to whom it should issue letters of marque. He regarded these principles to be quite as applicable to measures of coercion adopted against rebels as to the operations of a regular war.

This being the case, Great Britain and France would, Mr. Seward said obtain all they wanted, and there was no need that any question should, be raised by those two powers with the United States, as to whether the southern rebels were or were not invested with belligerent rights. France had made no public announcement on the subject; Great Britain had, indeed, issued a proclamation, and some of her Majesty's ministers had made declarations in Parliament. After all, however, the proclamation was addressed only to her Majesty's subjects; Americans, too, understood and respected, as much as Englishmen, the freedom of parliamentary debate. He should not take official cognizance of the recognition of the belligerent rights of southern rebels by Great Britain and France, unless he should be forced to do so by an official communication addressed to the government of the United States itself.

* * * * *

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 3, 1862, p. 10.]

No. 15.

Lord Lyons to Lord J. Russell.

[Extract.]

WASHINGTON, June 17, 1861.

In the course of the conversation which Mr. Seward held with M. Mercier and me yesterday, it appeared that he conceived that the communication which we were discussing with him was a matter entirely distinct from his proposal to adhere to the declaration of Paris. He seemed to have concluded, from a dispatch which he had received from Mr. Adams, that your lordship had authorized me to enter into a separate negotiation on that subject.

I have this morning explained to Mr. Seward how the matter really stands. He said, in reply, that he thought he had reason to complain

that the governments of Europe had taken no notice of the offer he had made to them long ago, to adhere, without reserve, to the declaration of Paris. He had announced that he preferred the proposal of Mr. Marcy, but if that was not acceptable, he was ready to agree to the declaration as it stood. He should now desire Mr. Adams to inform your lordship that he was willing that the negotiation should be carried on either here or in London, without further delay.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 21.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 19, 1861.

SIR :

It [Lord Russell's instructions to Lord Lyons] confines itself to stating what the British government require or expect the United States to do. Virtually, it asks us to concede to Great Britain the principles laid down in the declaration of the congress held at Paris in 1856. It asks indeed a little less, certainly nothing more or different from this. The British government ask this of us to-day, the 15th of June, in ignorance of the fact that we had, so early as the 24th of April, instructed you to tender, without reservation, to Great Britain our accession, pure and simple, to that declaration. We have all the while, since that instruction was sent forth, been ready, as we now are ready, to accede to the declaration, when and whenever Great Britain may be ready and willing to receive it. The argument contained in the instruction seems, therefore, to have been as unnecessary and irrelevant as it is unacceptable. Lord Lyons thinks that his instructions do not authorize him to enter into convention with us here. You will inform the government of Great Britain of the fact, and, if they prefer, you will enter into the convention at London.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES F. ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 3, 1862, p. 8.]

No. 13.

Lord J. Russell to Lord Lyons.

[Extract.]

FOREIGN OFFICE, June 21, 1861.

The United States minister at Paris has made propositions to the imperial government, founded on the answer of Mr. Marcy to the request formerly made to him, to adopt, on the part of his government, the declaration of Paris.

The government of the Emperor entirely concur with her Majesty's government in the opinion that these propositions ought to be rejected.

When I asked Mr. Adams whether he had similar propositions to make to her Majesty's government, he informed me that he had no instructions to do so.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

[Extracts.]

No. 22.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 22, 1861.

SIR:

We wish to act singly and in good faith with the French government. We understand, and shall continue to understand, that France does not concede belligerent rights to the insurgents in contravention of our sovereignty. We shall insist that she does nothing adverse to our position, whatever may be *said* to the contrary.

She has proposed to tell us that she thinks the Confederate States are entitled to belligerent rights. We have declined to hear that. We have not heard it. We shall continue to regard France as respecting our government, throughout the whole country, until she *practically acts in violation of her friendly obligations* to us, as we understand them. When she does *that*, it will be time enough to inquire whether, if we accede to the treaty of Paris, she could, after that, allow pirates upon our commerce shelter in her ports; and what our remedy then should be. We have no fear on this head.

We are dealing now as a nation at peace with France as a friend. We have told her that we shall not consent to her change of this relation.

She knows, distinctly, that if she accepts our adhesion to the declaration of the congress of Paris, the ground on which it is given by us. Why then should you hesitate to yield it?

While saying this, however, we also confess that our solicitude on the subject is not so intense now, since the responsibility for the next step remains with France and not with us.

Still we wish you to act directly and frankly, being always ready to perform all we have offered.

This dispatch is strictly confidential.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 12.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, June 22, 1861.

SIR: I have the honor to inclose to you a copy of the reply of Mr. Thouvenel to my proposition, on the part of the United States, to open negotiations for its accession to the treaty of Paris of 1856, according to the terms therein stated.

In our first conversation upon this subject, I understood from Mr. Thouvenel that on a written proposition from me for negotiation he would address the other powers (parties to the treaty) upon the subject. That a note from me would afford him a starting point for communicating with such powers. Upon further reflection, or upon conference with his associates in the government, he now writes that it will be necessary that I address myself jointly (if I understood him rightly) to all the powers associated in that treaty, before my proposition can be considered.

Our condition as respects privateering and the belligerent rights conceded to the South has been so changed by the action of Great Britain, France, and Spain, subsequent to the first declaration of Lord John Russell, (stating that such belligerent rights would be conceded,) that I know not what may be the views of the government of the United States at this time as respects an accession to the treaty of 1856, pure and simple. But as I have learned that nothing substantially has been done in that direction at other points, and I do not see that the interests of the country will be jeopardized by a little delay, I shall await further instructions upon this subject. My first dispatch referring to this matter was dated 22d of May last, and I doubt not I shall now receive an answer at an early day. If the government of the United States shall, in view of the circumstances, direct me to make the proposition to the French government to accede to the Paris treaty, pure and simple, I will, acting under such express direction, lose no time in making the proposition. * * * * *

With high consideration, I am yours, very truly,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

Secretary of State.

Mr. Thouvenel to Mr. Dayton.

[Translation.]

PARIS, June 20, 1861.

SIR: I have received the letter dated 31st of May, by which you make known to me that the government of the United States is disposed to accede to the declaration set forth by the congress of Paris on maritime right, provided that, to the enunciation of the first principle contained in this declaration, that of the abolition of privateering, there may be added these words: "And the private property of subjects or citizens of one of the belligerents shall not be seized upon the high seas by the vessels of war of the other belligerent unless it may be contraband of war."

After having examined this communication I must acknowledge that it does not differ from that which one of your honorable predecessors had been charged to make in 1857 upon this same question to the government of the Emperor. I cannot, therefore, but recall what Mr. le Comte Walewski replied at that period to Mr. Mason, namely, that the protocols of the congress of Paris impose upon all the powers, signers of the declaration of the 16th of April, the obligation not to negotiate separately upon the application of maritime right in time of war, any arrangement which differed from the declaration resolved upon in common. It is then only by embracing all the powers, signers of this act, in the proposition that you have done me the honor to communicate to me, that the cabinet of Washington will be able to urge the acceptance of it. The government of the Emperor will be in that case all disposed, so far as he is concerned, to examine it in concert with the different powers.

Accept, Monsieur le Ministre, the assurances of the high consideration with which I have the honor to be your very humble and very obedient servant,

THOUVENEL.

MR. DAYTON, *Minister of the United States.*

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 32.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 1, 1861.

SIR: Your dispatch No. 8 (dated June 14) has been received.

My dispatch, No. 21, of 19th ultimo, has anticipated the matters you have discussed in the paper now before me. It remains only to say that while we would prefer to add Mr. Marcy's amendment, exempting private property of non-belligerents from confiscation in maritime war, and desire you to stipulate to that effect if you can, yet we are, nevertheless, ready and willing to accede to the declaration of the congress of Paris, if the amendment cannot be obtained. In other words, we stand on the instructions contained in my aforesaid dispatch.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

No. 27.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 6, 1861.

SIR: Your dispatch No. 12 dated June 22d has been received. It relates to our proposition for accession to the declaration of Paris. This affair has become very much complicated, by reason, first, of the irregular and extraordinary proceeding of the French government in proposing to take notice of the domestic disturbance which has occurred in this country; and second, by reason of your departure from the instructions which had been given to you. I do not know that even now I can clear the matter up effectually without knowing what may be the result of the communication which, in my dispatch No. 19, I instructed you to make to the French government. I will try, nevertheless, to do so. The instructions contained in my dispatch No. 4, dated 24th of April last, required you to tender to the French government, without delay, our adhesion to the declaration of the congress of Paris, pure and simple.

The reason why we wished it done immediately was, that we supposed the French government would naturally feel a deep anxiety about the safety of their commerce, threatened distinctly by privateering by the insurgents, while at the same time, as this government had heretofore persistently declined to relinquish the right of issuing letters of marque, it would be apprehended by France that we too should take up that form of maritime warfare in the present domestic controversy. We apprehended that the danger of such a case of depredation upon commerce equally by the government itself and by its enemies, would operate as a provocation to France and other commercial nations to recognize the insurrectionary party in violation of our national rights and sovereignty. On the contrary, we did not desire to depredate on friendly commerce ourselves, and we thought it our duty to prevent such depredations by the insurgents by executing our own laws, which make privateering by disloyal citizens piracy, and provide for its punishment as such. We thought

it wise, just, and prudent to give, unasked, guarantees to France and other friendly nations for the security of their commerce from exposure to such depredations on either side, at the very moment when we were delivering to them our protest against the recognition of the insurgents. The accession to the declaration of Paris would be the form in which these guarantees could be given—that, for obvious reasons, must be more unobjectionable to France and to other commercial nations than any other. It was safe on our part, because we tendered it, of course, as the act of this federal government, to be obligatory equally upon disloyal as upon loyal citizens.

The instructions waived the Marcy amendment, (which proposed to exempt private property from confiscation in maritime war,) and required you to propose our accession to the declaration of the congress of Paris, pure and simple. These were the reasons for this course, namely: First. It was as well understood by this government then, as it is now by yourself, that an article of that celebrated declaration prohibits every one of the parties to it from negotiating upon the subject of neutral rights in maritime warfare with any nation not a party to it, except for the adhesion of such outstanding party to the declaration of the congress of Paris, pure and simple. An attempt to obtain an acceptance of Mr. Marcy's amendment would require a negotiation not merely with France alone, but with all the other original parties of the congress of Paris, and every government that has since acceded to the declaration. Nay, more: we must obtain their unanimous consent to the amendment before being able to commit ourselves or to engage any other nation, however well disposed, to commit itself to us on the propositions actually contained in the declaration. On the other hand, each nation which is a party to the declaration of Paris is at liberty to stipulate singly with us for acceptance of that declaration for the government of our neutral relations. If, therefore, we should waive the Marcy proposition, or leave it for ultimate consideration, we could establish a complete agreement between ourselves and France on a subject which, if it should be left open, might produce consequences very much to be deprecated. It is almost unnecessary to say that what we proposed to France was equally and simultaneously proposed to every other maritime power. In this way we expected to remove every cause that any foreign power could have for the recognition of the insurgents as a belligerent power.

The matter stood in this plain and intelligible way until certain declarations or expressions of the French government induced you to believe that they would recognize and treat the insurgents as a distinct national power for belligerent purposes. It was not altogether unreasonable that you, being at Paris, should suppose that this government would think itself obliged to acquiesce in such a course by the government of France. So assuming, you thought that we would not adhere to our proposition to accede to the declaration, pure and simple, since such a course would, as you thought, be effective to bind this government without binding the insurgents, and would leave France at liberty to hold us bound, and the insurgents free from the obligations created by our adhesion. Moreover, if we correctly understand your dispatch on that subject, you supposed that you might propose our adhesion to the treaty of Paris, not pure and simple, but with the addition of the Marcy proposition in the first instance, and might afterwards, in case of its being declined in that form, withdraw the addition, and then propose our accession to the declaration of Paris, pure and simple.

While you were acting on these views on your side of the Atlantic, we on this side, not less confident in our strength than in our rights, as

you are now aware, were acting on another view, which is altogether different, namely, that we shall not acquiesce in any declaration of the government of France that assumes that this government is not now, as it always has been, exclusive sovereign, for war as well as for peace, within the States and Territories of the federal Union, and over all citizens, the disloyal and loyal all alike. We treat in that character, which is our legal character, or we do not treat at all, and we in no way consent to compromise that character in the least degree; we do not even suffer this character to become a subject for discussion. Good faith and honor, as well as the same expediency which prompted the proffer of our accession to the declaration of Paris, pure and simple, in the first instance, now require us to adhere to that proposition and abide by it; and we do adhere to it, not, however, as a divided, but as an undivided nation. The proposition is tendered to France not as a neutral but as a friend, and the agreement is to be obligatory upon the United States and France and all their legal dependencies just alike. We are by no means to be understood as censuring you for acting not so much contrary to our instructions as independently of them.

The case was peculiar, and in the aspect in which it presented itself to you, portentous; when advised of your different views, we were content that you might risk the experiment, so, however, that you should not bring any responsibility for delay upon this government. But you now see that by incorporating the Marcy amendment in your proposition, you have encountered the very difficulty which was at first foreseen by us. The following nations are parties to the declaration of Paris, namely: Baden, Bavaria, Belgium, Bremen, Brazils, Duchy of Brunswick, Chili, the Argentine Confederation, the Germanic Confederation, Denmark, the Two Sicilies, the Republic of the Equator, the Roman States, Greece, Guatemala, Hayti, Hamburg, Hanover, the two Hesses, Lubeck, Mecklenburg-Strelitz, Mecklenburg-Schwerin, Nassau, Oldenburg, Parma, Holland, Peru, Portugal, Saxony, Saxe-Altenburg, Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, Saxe-Meiningen, Saxe-Weimar, Sweden, Switzerland, Tuscany, Wurtemberg, Anhalt, Dessau, Modena, New Granada, and Uruguay.

The great exigency in our affairs will have passed away—for preservation or destruction to the American Union—before we could bring all these nations to unanimity on the subject, as you have submitted it to Mr. Thouvenel. It is a time not for propagandism, but for energetic action to arrest the worst of all national calamities. We therefore expect you now to renew the proposition in the form originally prescribed. But in doing this you will neither unnecessarily raise a question about the character in which this government acts, (being exclusive sovereign,) nor, on the other hand, in any way compromise that character in any degree. Whenever such a question occurs to hinder you, let it come up from the other party in the negotiation. It will be time then to stop and wait for such further instructions as the new exigency may require.

One word more. You will, in any case, avow our preference for the proposition with the Marcy amendment incorporated, and will assure the government of France that whenever there shall be any hope for the adoption of that beneficent feature by the necessary parties, as a principle of the law of nations, we shall be ready not only to agree to it, but even to propose it, and to lead in the necessary negotiations.

This paper is, in one view, a conversation merely between yourself and us. It is not to be made public. On the other hand, we confide in your discretion to make such explanations as will relieve yourself of embarrassments, and this government of any suspicion of inconsistency or

indirection in its intercourse with the enlightened and friendly government of France.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 3, 1862, p. 14.]

No. 22.

Lord Lyons to Lord J. Russell.

WASHINGTON, July 8, 1861.

MY LORD: Mr. Seward called upon me the day before yesterday, and asked me to give him a list of the powers which have acceded to the declaration of Paris on maritime law. He said that he had observed a list of those powers in your lordship's dispatch to me of the 18th May, which I had left with him for a few days.

I readily agreed to send him the list.

He went on to tell me that he was endeavoring to disentangle a complication which had been produced by Mr. Dayton at Paris. Mr. Dayton had, he said, been instructed to state to the French government that the government of the United States preferred the proposal of Mr. Marcy, by which private property would be altogether exempted from capture, but that, nevertheless, they were willing, if necessary, to accede at once to the declaration of Paris, "pure and simple," and to postpone the discussion of Mr. Marcy's proposal to a more propitious moment. Mr. Dayton, however, when he saw that France had accorded belligerent rights to the rebels, became alarmed, and conceived that an acceptance of the declaration of Paris would be injurious to the United States, inasmuch as it would preclude them from employing privateers without imposing a similar restriction on the insurgents. He had, therefore, departed from his instructions, and made, on his own responsibility, proposals intended to avert this danger. Now (Mr. Seward went on to say) if, on the one hand, the government of the United States declared that they held their accession to the Paris declaration to impose an obligation on France with regard to all the States of the Union, the disloyal as well as the loyal; or if, on the other hand, the government of France announced that it did not intend, by accepting the accession of the United States, to contract any engagement affecting the States in revolt, then Mr. Dayton's apprehensions might be well founded; but if nothing was said on either side concerning this particular point, the accession of the United States might be given at once, and accepted, and the effect of it with regard to the States in revolt be determined afterwards.

Mr. Seward proceeded to tell me that the French government had very naturally observed that the proposal of Mr. Marcy had been made to them before, and had been rejected because it was inconsistent with the agreement made by the declaration of Paris.

Mr. Seward said that France was willing, for her part, to accept the accession of the United States "pure and simple," but considered it necessary that the consent of all the other acceding powers should be obtained. This Mr. Seward seemed to consider would lead to interminable delays, and put it in the power of any one, even the smallest of the acceding governments, to defeat the whole plan.

I told Mr. Seward that I did not conceive that any greater delay would be incurred than that which was necessary in order to communicate in the simplest and most expeditious manner with powers, some of which were certainly at a considerable distance. I added that I supposed the accession of the United States would be received with great satisfaction by every government.

Mr. Seward observed that he presumed that, in practice, England and France had now all the security they could desire. This government recognized the principles that the flag covers the cargo, and that the goods of a friend are free under an enemy's flag. It would do all in its power to protect the commerce of friends from the attacks of the so-called privateers of the rebels, and would hang the privateer crews as pirates.

I hinted to Mr. Seward that this last measure was one which would be anything but acceptable to Great Britain or France; that neither power could desire to see the present contest assume the character of ferocity which would be thus imparted to it.

After saying a few words on other topics, Mr. Seward took leave of me.

Later in the day I sent him, in a blank envelope, a list of the powers which have acceded to the declaration of Paris, copied from your lordship's dispatch of the 18th of May last.

Notwithstanding the opinion expressed by Mr. Seward, I continue to think it very important, with a view to preventing serious disputes in future, that Great Britain and France should not accept the accession of this government to the declaration of Paris without stating to it, formally and distinctly, beforehand, the effect which their so doing is intended by them to have with regard to the seceded States.

I have, &c.,

LYONS.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 14.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, July 12, 1861.

SIR: Your dispatches, from No. 2, to No. 25, inclusive, were received at this office early in the present week.

I have read the first of these papers, containing further instructions to me, and dated on the 21st of June, with close attention. My prevailing feeling has been one of profound surprise at the course of this government throughout the present difficulty. First. It prepares, in the form of an instruction to Lord Lyons, a paper to be presented to you, among other things "virtually asking you to concede the principles laid down in the declaration of the congress held in Paris in 1856." Secondly. When in obedience to my instructions I propose to offer a project to Lord John Russell, actually designed to do the very thing desired, I am told the directions have already been sent out to Lord Lyons to arrange matters on the basis proposed by the American government of the three articles, omitting the fourth altogether. Thirdly. Lord Lyons expresses the opinion to you that his instructions do not authorize him to enter into a convention with you in the United States. Fourthly. When, concurrently with these events, Mr. Dayton proposes to negotiate on the same basis with France, I am informed that this proposal has been communicated to the ministry here, and that no definite conclusion

had been arrived at. I must say that a more remarkable series of misunderstandings has seldom come within my observation.

I now propose to bring this matter to a distinct issue. To this end I have addressed a letter to Lord John Russell, to know whether, under the renewed instructions of the present dispatch, he is disposed to open the negotiation here. The advantage of this will be that I shall get an answer in writing, which will admit of no misconception. A copy of that answer will be forwarded so soon as it is received.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 17.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, July 19, 1861.

SIR: Your dispatch, No. 32, dated the 1st of July, relating to the communications between the two governments respecting the declaration of the convention at Paris in 1856, reached me soon after I had addressed a formal letter to Lord John Russell, designed to bring the matter to a definite point. In my No. 14, dated on the 12th, I stated the fact that I had sent such a letter, and I promised that I would forward his lordship's answer so soon as it should be received. I now transmit copies of my letter and of the answer.

It is not a little singular that his lordship's memory of what passed at our first interview on this subject should differ so widely from mine. It would seem by his account that he had been the first to mention the instructions to Lord Lyons to propose a negotiation on the subject of the declaration of Paris, and that I had thereupon expressed the opinion that it would be well to leave it in your hands, in which opinion he fully concurred.

On my side, I am quite certain that the discussion which actually took place between us involved a wholly different class of topics of a very critical nature, and never touched upon the declaration of Paris until it had exhausted itself on the others. It was by that time late, and I then opened the new subject by remarking that there would be no time to do more than to allude to it at this conference. I first mentioned the fact that I had instructions to propose a negotiation upon the disputed point of the Paris declarations, and the necessary powers to perfect an agreement if her Majesty's government were disposed to enter into it. It was this proposal that elicited the explanations of his lordship as to what had been already done, and the expression of an opinion that the instructions sent to Lord Lyons were of such a kind as to make some agreement on your side so very likely as to render any treatment of the same matter here inadvisable; and it was then that I concurred in his opinion.

As things now stand, perhaps this difference of recollection in the present instance may not be material. But there might be cases in which it would be of so much moment that I think hereafter I shall prefer, upon essential points, to conduct the affairs of this legation a little more in writing than I have heretofore thought necessary.

At the hour appointed in his note I waited upon his lordship for the

first time, at his official residence in Downing street. After comparing our respective remembrance of the facts in dispute, I went on to repeat what I maintained I had at first proposed, to wit: that I was ready to negotiate if her Majesty's government were so disposed. To that end I had brought my powers, and also the project of a convention, copies of both of which papers I offered to leave with him. He remarked that at this stage it was not necessary to look at the powers. The other one he took and examined. The first remark which he made was that it was essentially the declaration of Paris. He had never known until now that the government of the United States were disposed to accede to it. He was sure that I had never mentioned it. To this I assented, but observed that the reason why I had not done so was that my government had directed me to make a preliminary inquiry, and that was to know whether her Majesty's ministers were disposed to enter into any negotiation at all. It was because of my understanding his lordship to say that he preferred to leave the matter with Lord Lyons that I had considered negotiation here to be declined. I had also heard, through his lordship, of a proposition since made by Mr. Dayton on this subject to the French government, and which had been communicated to him, that led me to suppose the matter might be taking its shape at Paris. His lordship observed that Mr. Dayton's proposal was nothing more than a repetition of that made by Mr. Marcy, which they were not willing to accede to. I then said that Mr. Marcy's amendment was undoubtedly the first wish of my government. I also had instructions to press it, if there was the smallest probability of success; but I understood that this matter had been definitively settled. His lordship signified his assent to this remark, and added that I might consider the proposition as inadmissible. He would therefore take the copy of the project of a convention which I had offered him, for the purpose of submitting it to the consideration of his colleagues in the cabinet, and let me know when he should be ready to meet me again.

In the course of conversation I took the occasion to remark upon that passage of his lordship's note to me which related to the manner in which other states had signified their adherence to the declaration. I called his attention to the fact that, whatever might be the course elsewhere, the peculiar structure of our government required some distinct form of agreement or convention to be made with foreign states, upon which the Senate could exercise their legitimate authority of confirmation or rejection. He seemed at once to understand the force of this observation, and to assent to the necessity. Yet I foresaw at the time the difficulty in which it would place the British government in its relations with the other parties to the convention at Paris. The reply of his lordship, this moment come to hand, a copy of which is herewith submitted, explains it fully, and leaves the matter in the same state of suspense that it was in before.

Under these circumstances, and presuming it to be the wish of the President that no time be lost, I shall write to Mr. Dayton, at Paris, to know whether he considers himself authorized to proceed to conclude a similar arrangement with the French government; if so, I shall try to go on without waiting for further instructions; if not, I shall hold myself ready to act here so soon as this difficulty shall have been removed elsewhere.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

HON. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Lord John Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, July 11, 1861.

MY LORD: From the tenor of the last dispatches received from the Department of State at Washington, I am led to suppose that there has been some misunderstanding in regard to the intentions of her Majesty's government respecting a proposal to negotiate upon the basis of the declaration of the congress held at Paris in 1856. In the first conversation which I had the honor to hold with your lordship, so long ago as the 18th of May last, in answer to an offer then made by myself, under instructions from my government, I certainly understood your lordship to say that the subject had already been committed to the care of Lord Lyons, at Washington, with authority to accept the proposition of the government of the United States, adopting three articles of the declaration at Paris, and to drop the fourth altogether. For this reason you preferred not to enter into the question on this side of the water. I am now informed that Lord Lyons thinks his instructions do not authorize him to enter into convention with the authorities at Washington, and am instructed to apprise her Majesty's government of the fact.

Under these circumstances, I am directed once more to renew the proposition here, and to say that, if agreeable to your lordship, I am prepared to present to your consideration a project of a convention at any moment which it may be convenient to you to appoint.

Seizing the occasion to renew the assurance of my highest consideration, I have the honor to be your lordship's most obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCOIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. Lord JOHN RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

Lord John Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *July 13, 1861.*

SIR: I have just had the honor to receive your letter dated the 11th instant.

In the first conversation I had the honor to hold with you, on the 18th of May, I informed you that instructions had been sent to Lord Lyons to propose to the government of the United States to adopt the second, third, and fourth articles of the declaration of Paris, dropping the first altogether.

You informed me that you had instructions on the same subject; but I understood you to express an opinion, in which I fully concurred, that it would be well to leave the question in the hands of the Secretary of State at Washington.

Lord Lyons had instructions to make an agreement with the government of the United States, but he had no express authority to sign a convention.

The states who have adhered to the declaration of Paris have generally, if not invariably, done so by dispatches or notes, and not by conventions.

As, however, you have been instructed to present to her Majesty's government, for consideration, a project of a convention, I shall be happy to see you at the foreign office at three o'clock to-day, for the purpose of receiving that project.

I request you to receive the assurance of my highest consideration,
and have the honor to be, sir, your most obedient servant,

J. RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Lord John Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, July 18, 1861.

SIR: Upon considering your propositions of Saturday last I have two remarks to make.

First. The course hitherto followed has been a simple notification of adherence to the declaration of Paris by those states which were not originally parties to it.

Secondly. The declaration of Paris was one embracing various powers, with a view to general concurrence upon questions of maritime law, and not an insulated engagement between two powers only.

Her Majesty's government are willing to waive entirely any objection on the first of these heads, and to accept the form which the government of the United States prefers.

With regard to the second, her Majesty's government are of opinion that they should be assured that the United States are ready to enter into a similar engagement with France, and with other maritime powers who are parties to the declaration of Paris, and do not purpose to make singly and separately a convention with Great Britain only.

But as much time might be required for separate communications between the government of the United States and all the maritime powers who were parties to or have acceded to the declaration of Paris, her Majesty's government would deem themselves authorized to advise the Queen to conclude a convention on this subject with the President of the United States so soon as they shall have been informed that a similar convention has been agreed upon, and is ready for signature, between the President of the United States and the Emperor of the French, so that the two conventions might be signed simultaneously and on the same day.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

J. RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 3, p. 12.]

No. 20.

Mr. Adams to Lord J. Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, July 19, 1861.

MY LORD: In reply to the note dated yesterday from your lordship, I beg to say that I shall take immediate measures to communicate with Mr. Dayton at Paris, touching the extent of his powers to negotiate upon the same basis proposed by me with the government of France. If it should turn out that he is both authorized and disposed to proceed at once, there will not, perhaps, be a necessity for interposing further

delay in order to communicate once more with the government at Washington. If, on the contrary, his answer should be unfavorable, I shall be compelled to ask a postponement of the negotiation until the dispatch forwarded this day to the United States shall have produced further instructions from the President. I will do myself the honor to apprise you of the result of my inquiry as soon as I shall obtain it.

With renewed assurances, I have, &c.,

CHARLES FRANCOIS ADAMS.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 20.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, July 26, 1861.

SIR: At the close of my dispatch No. 17, on the subject of my last conference with Lord John Russell, I mentioned my intention to write to Mr. Dayton, at Paris, to know whether he felt authorized to proceed in a simultaneous negotiation on the subject of the declaration of the congress at Paris. I have now to report that I executed my purpose on the 19th instant.

On the evening of the 24th I received a note from Mr. Dayton announcing his arrival in town and his wish to confer with me upon this matter.

Yesterday morning I had the pleasure of a full and free conversation with him, in the course of which we carefully compared our respective instructions and the action taken under them.

I am very glad that he has taken the trouble to come over to see me, for I confess that I was a little embarrassed by not knowing the precise nature of his proposal to the French government at the time when I heard of it from Lord John Russell. Had I been informed of it I should perhaps have shaped my own course a little differently. So I doubt not that he would have been pleased to know more exactly my own proceedings as well as the more specific character of my instructions. An hour's interview has had the effect to correct our impressions better than could have been accomplished by an elaborate correspondence.

I can now perfectly understand as well as enter into the reasons which prompted his proposal of the declaration of Paris, connected as it was with the modification first suggested by Mr. Marcy. There can be no doubt that the attempt to secure such an extension of the application of the principle contained in the first point of that declaration was worth making, on the part of the new administration, particularly at a place where there was no reason to presume any disinclination to adopt it. Neither did the reply of Mr. Thouvenel entirely preclude the hope of ultimate success, so far as the disposition of France may be presumed.

The obstacles, if any there are, must be inferred to have been thought to exist elsewhere. And an advance could be expected only when the efforts to remove them had been applied with effect in the proper quarter. It was, therefore, both natural and proper for Mr. Dayton, after having made his offer, and received such an answer, to wait patiently until it should become apparent that such efforts had been made, and made without success.

There can be no doubt that the opposition to this modification centers here. Independently of the formal announcement of Lord John Russell to me that the proposition was declined, I have, from other sources of infor-

nation, some reason to believe that it springs from the tenacity of a class of influential persons, by their age and general affinities, averse to all sudden variations from established ideas. Such people are not to be carried away by novel reasoning, however forcible. We have cause to feel the presence of a similar power at home, though in a vastly reduced degree.

All modifications of the public law, however beneficent, naturally meet with honest resistance in these quarters for a time. It is to be feared that this may have the effect of defeating, at this moment, the application of the noble doctrines of the declaration of Paris, in the full expansion of which they are susceptible. But to my mind the failure to reach that extreme point will not justify the United States in declining to accept the good which is actually within their grasp. The declaration of the leading powers of civilized Europe, made at Paris in 1856, engrafted upon the law of nations for the first time great principles for which the government of the United States had always contended against some of those powers, and down to that time had contended in vain.

That great act was the virtual triumph of their policy all over the globe. It was the sacrifice, on the part of Great Britain, of notions she had ever before held to with the most unrelenting rigidity. It would therefore seem as if any reluctance to acknowledge this practical amount of benefit, obtained on the mere ground that something remained to require, was calculated only to wither the laurels gained by our victory.

It would almost seem like a retrograde tendency to the barbarism of former ages. Surely it is not in the spirit of the reformed government in America to give countenance to any such impression. Whatever may have been the character of the policy in later years, the advent of another and a better power should be marked by a recurrence to the best doctrines ever proclaimed in the national history. And if it so happen that they are not now adopted by others to the exact extent that we would prefer, the obvious course of wisdom would seem to be to accept the good which can be obtained, and patiently to await another opportunity when a continuance of exertions in the same direction may enable us to secure everything that is left to be desired.

I think that Mr. Dayton has waited only to be convinced that his proposed modification cannot be secured before he acts upon the authority given him to accede to the declaration of Paris, pure and simple.

On my part, I have apprised him of the answer made to me by Lord John Russell at our last conference. But he wishes some evidence upon which he can rely a little more securely than a report of conversation. And, considering the remarkable discrepancy in the recollection of the conferences with his lordship which has thus far taken place, I am not surprised. In order to meet this difficulty he has addressed to me a letter of inquiry, which I propose to answer. At the same time I design to address a letter to his lordship, recapitulating the portion of his conversation that is in question, and informing him that, *on the assumption that I understood him right*, Mr. Dayton consents to proceed. This will, of course, render it necessary for him to explain himself, if the fact should be otherwise.

Mr. Dayton will, of course, communicate directly with the department as to the later measures which he may think proper to take.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extracts.]

No. 49.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 29, 1861.

SIR: Your dispatch of July 12, 1861, No. 14, has been received.

Your proposition of making a distinct appeal to the British government on the subject of the issue between it and this government, upon the questions so long discussed, is approved. We shall look with much interest for the answer of that government.

* * * * *
Some important points in your dispatch will be treated of in another paper.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCOIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

[Extracts.]

No. 22.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, July 30, 1861.

SIR: On the 21st of this month I received a note from Mr. Adams, a copy of which, marked A, is hereunto annexed, apprising me that, under renewed instructions from the government at Washington, he had proposed to the British government, on the 11th of this month, to negotiate on the basis of the project which had been transmitted to him soon after his arrival at London, touching the four points of the declaration of the convention at Paris in 1856, and inquiring whether I felt empowered and disposed to remove the obstacle of delay by entering at once into an arrangement for simultaneous action with the Emperor of the French. Accompanying his note was the copy of a communication from Lord John Russell, dated July 18, 1861. * * *

Feeling the great importance of this matter, and mindful of your request that we should confer together when we could, I immediately went over to London.

I found, by the date of your renewed instructions to Mr. Adams, that you did not intend the negotiation upon this question should be conducted at Washington, but that it should be done on this side; and, further, that with a full knowledge of all the facts, the original purpose of acceding to the treaty of Paris of 1856 was adhered to. Under these circumstances, I felt it my duty to say to Mr. Adams that there need be no delay on my account. To facilitate matters, while I was yet in London I made to him, in writing, a communication to that effect, of which I send you a copy, marked B.

You will observe that I ask Mr. Adams, in this communication, whether Great Britain has, at his instance, or otherwise, considered the Marcy amendment? This was done after conference with him, and after he had told me what would be his answer. He said that after I had made the proposition here it was considered at London, and Lord John

Russell, upon his (Mr. Adams) suggesting this amendment to the treaty there, said at once that the principle was inadmissible; that the British government would not assent to it. This answer I thought it most desirable we should have on record, and therefore made a suggestion in my note which Mr. Adams said he would adopt. Great Britain, so far as I know, never has, before this, distinctly placed herself on record against the adoption of that humane and noble principle as a provision of maritime law.

I was much gratified that I had gone over to London. I felt a sense of relief in conferring with Mr. Adams upon questions of so much importance, and got knowledge of some facts of which I had no knowledge before. I was in England but two days, and then returned immediately to Paris. I missed, however, the mail by the steamer of last week, which I much regretted.

With much respect, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

A.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Dayton

[Extract.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, July 19, 1861.

SIR:

I have the honor to apprise you that, under a renewal of instructions from the government at Washington, I proposed to her Majesty's government on Thursday, the 11th of this month, to negotiate on the basis of a project, which had been transmitted to me soon after my arrival at this post, touching the four points of the declaration of the convention at Paris in 1856. I have reasons to presume that powers to complete a similar agreement with the government of France were sent to you at or about the same time. You will see by the terms of Lord John Russell's reply to me, a copy of which is herewith conveyed to you, that he consents to proceed only upon the condition that a similar negotiation shall go on *pari passu* at Paris.

The object of this inquiry, then, is to know whether you feel empowered and disposed to remove this obstacle of delay by entering at once into an arrangement for simultaneous action with the Emperor of the French, or whether it will be necessary for me to suspend operations here until further instructions shall have been received from Washington.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

His Excellency Hon. W. L. DAYTON, &c., &c., &c., *Paris.*

B.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Adams.

LONDON, *July 25, 1861.*

SIR: Yours of the 19th instant, inclosing a copy of Lord John Russell's of the 18th instant, was duly received by me at Paris. My powers

to negotiate with France an accession by the United States to the treaty of Paris of 1856 are of the same general character as your own. Under those powers and instructions received by me from Washington, I did propose such accession to the government of France, but with an addition to the first clause of the following words: "And the private property of subjects or citizens of one of the belligerents shall not be seized upon the high seas, by the vessels of war of the other belligerents, unless it may be contraband of war." To this proposition I received an answer from the French minister of foreign affairs, dated June 20, 1861, the substance of which was that the French government declined to consider the proposition (inasmuch as it differed from the provisions of the treaty of Paris) unless it was addressed to all the powers who were parties to that convention. In the meantime I saw it stated in the public press of Europe that the British, French, Spanish, and Belgian governments had made a declaration of their intentions as respects their conduct towards the United States government and the insurgents of the South, and I was not certain whether our government would desire, under the circumstances, that the proposition to accede to the treaty in question, without the amendment, should be made.

Your renewed instructions to proceed on the basis of that treaty are subsequent to and with a full knowledge by our government of the facts hereinbefore stated.

Under these circumstances, therefore, I feel authorized and required to proceed without further delay. Before, however, I shall communicate further with the French government, I wish to know whether Great Britain has, at your instance, or otherwise, considered the amendment of the treaty hereinbefore referred to. Before abandoning the hope of obtaining the incorporation in our code of maritime law of that great and humane principle, it seems to me desirable that we should have distinct assurance that the principle will not be admitted. I do not recollect that Great Britain has any time, heretofore, answered distinctly, if at all, upon that proposition, but seems rather to have avoided it. I think it desirable that that answer should be of record, (either in a note from or to you,) so that the responsibility may attach, through all time, where it properly belongs.

Immediately upon the receipt of your answer I will inclose a copy of your notes, in connection with that from Lord John Russell to the French government, and, as soon as heard from, advise you of its reply.

Respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

His Excellency CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 22.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,

London, August 2, 1861.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit the copy of a note addressed by me, on the 29th of July last, to Lord John Russell, and likewise a copy of his lordship's reply. I must frankly admit that I do not understand the meaning of the last paragraph.

I have transmitted a copy of his lordship's note to Mr. Dayton. I doubt not that it will be deemed by him so far satisfactory as to induce him to take the necessary measures for a simultaneous negotiation as

soon as the customary arrangements with the French government can be made.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

HON. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Lord Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, July 29, 1861.

MY LORD: I have the honor now to inform your lordship that, in consonance with the intention expressed in my note of the 19th instant, I have written to Mr. Dayton, at Paris, touching the extent of his powers to negotiate upon the same basis proposed by me to you, with the government of France, to which he is accredited. I have also to say that since the date of my writing I have had the pleasure to converse personally with him as well as to receive a letter from him in answer to my inquiry.

Mr. Dayton informs me that some time since he made a proposal to the French government to adopt the declaration of the congress of Paris in 1856, with an addition to the first clause, in substance the same with that heretofore proposed by his predecessor, Mr. Mason, under instructions given by Mr. Marcy, then the Secretary of State of the United States. To that proposal he received an answer from the French minister of foreign affairs, declining to consider the proposition, not for any objection entertained against it, but because it was a variation from the terms of the original agreement requiring a prior reference of it to the other parties to that convention. This answer does not, in his opinion, make the ultimate acceptance of his addition impossible, and he does not feel as if he ought to abandon the support of what he considers as so beneficent an amendment to the original plan until he has reason to despair of success. He has therefore requested to know of me whether I have reason to believe perseverance in this direction to be fruitless.

For my part, I entirely concur in the view entertained by Mr. Dayton of the value of this amendment. I also know so well the interest that my government takes in its adoption as to be sure that it would refuse to justify a further procedure on our part which was not based upon a reasonable certainty that success is not attainable, at least at the present moment. I have, therefore, ventured to state to Mr. Dayton my belief that I have that certainty. I have therefore mentioned to him, what I have likewise communicated to the proper department of the government of the United States, the fact that in the last conference I had the honor to hold with your lordship, allusion having been made to the amendment of Mr. Dayton, I said that that amendment was undoubtedly the first wish of my government, and that I had instructions to press it if there was the smallest probability of success, but that I supposed this matter to have been already definitively acted upon. To which I understood your lordship to signify your assent, and to add that I might consider the proposition as inadmissible. If I have made no mistake in reporting the substance of what passed between us, Mr. Dayton tells me he is satisfied, and expresses his readiness to proceed on the basis proposed by me to your lordship with the French government. But in order

to remove all probability of misconception between him and myself, I have taken the liberty of recalling your lordship's attention to the matter before it may be too late. Should there have been any essential error of fact on the main point, I trust your lordship will do me the favor to set me right.

Should it happen, on the contrary, that I am correct, I believe it will not be necessary to interpose any delay in the negotiation for further reference to the government of the United States. Mr. Dayton will take the necessary steps to apprise the government of the Emperor of the French of his intention to accede to the declaration of Paris, pure and simple, and the negotiations may be carried on simultaneously in both countries as soon as the necessary arrangements can be perfected on the respective sides.

However my government may regret that it has not been able to expand the application of the principles of the declaration of Paris to the extent which it deems desirable, it is too well convinced of the great value of the recognition actually given to those principles by the great powers of Europe in that act longer to hesitate in giving in its cordial adhesion. But it ardently cherishes the hope that time and the favoring progress of correct opinion may before long bring about opportunities for additional developments of the system they initiate, through the co-operation of all maritime nations of the earth, and most especially of one so enlightened and philanthropic as Great Britain.

Renewing the assurances of my highest consideration, I have the honor to be your lordship's most obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCOIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. Lord JOHN RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

Lord Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, July 31, 1861.

SIR: I have had the honor to receive your letter of the 29th instant, in which you inform me that Mr. Dayton some time since made a proposal to the French government to adopt the declaration of the congress of Paris in 1856, with an addition to the first clause, in substance the same with that heretofore proposed by his predecessor, Mr. Mason, under instructions given by Mr. Marcy, then the Secretary of State of the United States. After giving an account of the reception given to that proposition by the French government, and the value attached to it by Mr. Dayton and yourself, you proceed to state that in a conversation with me you told me that the addition proposed was the first wish of your government, and that you had instructions to press it if there was the smallest probability of success, but that you supposed this matter to have been already definitively acted upon. You represent me as signifying my assent, and adding that I considered the proposition as inadmissible.

So far as I am concerned, this statement is perfectly correct.

You go on to inform me that in the case of your statement being correct, Mr. Dayton will take the necessary steps to apprise the French government of his intention to accede to the declaration of Paris, "pure and simple," and that the negotiations may be carried on simultaneously in both countries as soon as the necessary arrangements can be perfected on the respective sides.

You will doubtless recollect that in my letter of the 18th instant, I stated that "her Majesty's government are of opinion that they should be assured that the United States are ready to enter into a similar engagement with France, and with the other maritime powers who are parties to the declaration of Paris, and do not propose to make simply and separately a convention with Great Britain only."

But as I agreed in the same letter to waive this assurance, and as I conclude that, in point of fact, the United States are willing to sign similar conventions with all the states parties to the declaration of Paris, I shall be ready to carry on the negotiations as soon as the necessary arrangements can be perfected in London and Paris, so that the conventions may be signed simultaneously at those two capitals.

I need scarcely add that on the part of Great Britain the engagement will be prospective, and will not invalidate anything already done.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

J. RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,

No. 24.]

Paris, August 2, 1861.

SIR: Your dispatch No. 27 was not received by me until after my return from London.

By my note to Mr. Adams, written in London, and to be found in dispatch No. 22, you will find your instructions were anticipated by my action; that immediately upon learning, from a reliable source, what were the views of the government in regard to an accession to the treaty of Paris, expressed with full knowledge of facts occurring since its original instructions to me, I at once took measures to comply with them, without attempting to balance the suggestions of my own mind against its known wishes. But I confess that in a matter of such grave importance as an accession by the United States to that treaty, I did want those wishes distinctly expressed with full knowledge of the facts. You will observe, by the copy of a communication to the minister of foreign affairs, (marked A,) and hereunto annexed, that I have already moved in the matter here.

With much respect, I have the honor to be your obedient servant,
WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

A.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Thouvenel.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,

Paris, August 2, 1861.

SIR: I had the honor to inform your excellency some time since that I was authorized, upon the part of the United States, to treat with any person or persons authorized by the Emperor concerning the principles of maritime law which affect neutral and belligerent rights at sea, and other matters connected therewith, of interest to the two nations, and

on the 31st of May last proposed to your excellency an accession by the United States to the treaty of Paris of 1856, with certain words of addition thereto.

Under date of 26th of June last, I received a reply from your excellency stating that the protocols of the congress of Paris impose upon all the powers who signed the declaration of the 16th of April, the obligation not to negotiate, separately, upon the application of maritime rights in time of war, any arrangement which differed from the declaration resolved upon in common, and that, as a consequence, it would be necessary that my offer include the other powers signing the declaration before it would be considered.

At the time the foregoing offer was made I had some reason to believe that it might be accepted by all the powers who negotiated that treaty, but subsequent information (the nature of which I have explained to you) has satisfied me that this was an error.

The government of the United States would have preferred the incorporation in the treaty of the amendment before referred to; and when there shall be any hope for the adoption of that beneficent feature by the necessary parties as a principle of the law of nations, the United States will not only be ready to agree to it, but even to propose it, and to lead in the necessary negotiations.

Under existing circumstances I am satisfied that I would not be justified in further delaying negotiations for an accession by the United States to the treaty of Paris of 1856, in the vain hope that the amendment in question, if proposed to all the powers, would, at present, be accepted. I have the honor, therefore, to apprise your excellency that I am prepared, on the part of the government of the United States, and hereby propose to your excellency to enter into a convention with the Emperor of the French for accession by the United States to the "declaration concerning maritime law" adopted by the plenipotentiaries of France, Great Britain, Austria, Prussia, Russia, Sardinia, and Turkey, at Paris, on the 16th of April, 1856, and that I have special authority for this purpose from the President of the United States, dated 26th of April last, which I shall be happy to submit to your excellency. I beg likewise, in this connection, to say to your excellency that a like proposition has been made by Mr. Adams to her Britannic Majesty, and herewith I deem it proper to inclose you a copy of the reply of Lord John Russell.

With much respect, I have the honor to be your very obedient servant,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

MONSIEUR LE MINISTRE.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 55.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, August 6, 1861.

SIR: Your dispatch No. 17, of the date of July 19, has been received.

I entirely approve of the letter which you addressed to Lord John Russell, of the 11th, a copy of which accompanied that dispatch, and I wait now with impatience, yet not without some solicitude, for the action of the British government upon our propositions which were so early sent forward in good faith, and which by such strange accidents have been so long in reaching the cabinet of Great Britain.

I need hardly tell you that the same mail which conveyed our propositions concerning maritime rights for the consideration of the British

government, carried also propositions literally the same for the consideration of the French government, and that of every other maritime power in Europe.

All those powers are understood to be awaiting the action of the government of Great Britain.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 3, 1862, p. 16.]

No. 26.

Earl Cowley to Earl Russell.

[Extract.]

PARIS, August 8, 1861.

Mr. Dayton has informed M. Thouvenel that he is now in a position to sign with him a convention embodying the four points contained in the declaration of Paris, and that he will lose no time in furnishing his excellency with a draught instrument.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 58.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, August 12, 1861.

SIR: Your dispatch of July 26 (No. 20) has been received. I am glad that you have had a full and satisfactory conversation with Mr. Dayton. It seems probable that we shall now be able to arrive at an understanding with the governments of Great Britain and France on the subject of international law relating to maritime war.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 61.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, August 17, 1861.

SIR: Your dispatch of August 2, No 22, has been received. It is accompanied by a correspondence which has just taken place between yourself and Lord John Russell, with a view, on your part, to remove possible obstructions against the entrance upon negotiations, with which you have so long been charged, for an accession on our part to the declaration of the congress of Paris on the subject of the rights of neutrals in maritime war. It was also understood by you that a further result of the correspondence would be to facilitate, indirectly, the opening of similar negotiations for a like object, by Mr. Dayton, with the government of France.

Your letter to Lord John Russell is judicious, and is approved. Lord John Russell's answer is satisfactory, with the exception of a single passage, upon which it is my duty to instruct you to ask the British secretary for foreign affairs for an explanation.

That passage is as follows:

"I need scarcely add that on the part of Great Britain the engagement will be prospective, and will not invalidate anything already done."

A brief statement of the objects of the proposed negotiation will bring the necessity for an explanation of the passage into a strong light. We have heretofore proposed to other maritime states certain meliorations of the laws of maritime war affecting the rights of neutrals. These meliorations are: 1st. That the neutral flag shall protect enemy's goods, not contraband of war. 2d. That the goods of neutrals, not contraband, though found under an enemy's flag, shall not be confiscated. 3d. That blockades, to be respected, must be effective.

The congress at Paris adopted these three principles, adding a fourth, namely, that privateering shall be abolished. The powers which constituted that congress invited the adhesion of the United States to that declaration. The United States answered that they would accede on condition that the other powers would accept a fifth proposition, namely, that the goods of private persons, non-combatant, should be exempt from confiscation in maritime war.

When this answer was given by the United States, the British government declined to accept the proposed amendment, or fifth proposition, thus offered by the United States, and the negotiation was then suspended. We have now proposed to renew the negotiation, offering our adhesion to the declaration of Paris, as before, with the amendment which would exempt private property from confiscation in maritime war.

The British government now, as before, declares that amendment or fifth proposition inadmissible. It results that, if the United States can at all become a party to the declaration of the congress of Paris by the necessary consent of the parties already committed to it, it can be done only by their accepting that declaration without any amendment whatever, in other words, "pure and simple." Under these circumstances, you have proposed in your letter to Lord John Russell to negotiate our adhesion to the declaration in that form. It is at this stage of the affair that Lord John Russell interposes, by way of caution, the remark that, "on the part of Great Britain the engagement will be prospective, and will not invalidate anything already done."

I need dwell on this remark only one moment to show that, although expressed in a very simple form and in a casual manner, it contains what amounts to a preliminary condition, which must be conceded by the United States to Great Britain, and either be inserted in the convention, and so modify our adhesion to the declaration of Paris, or else must be in some confidential manner implied and reserved, with the same effect.

Upon principle, this government could not consent to enter into formal negotiations, the result of which, as expressed in a convention, should be modified or restricted by a tacit or implied reservation. Even if such a proceeding was compatible with our convictions of propriety, or of expediency, there would yet remain an insuperable obstacle in the way of such a measure.

The President can only initiate a treaty. The treaty negotiated can come into life only through an express and deliberate act of ratification by the Senate of the United States, which ratification sanctions, in any case, only what is set down in the treaty itself. I am not, by any means, to be understood in these remarks as implying a belief that Lord John Russell desires, expects, or contemplates the practice of any reservation on the part of the United States or of Great Britain. The fact of his having given you the caution upon which I am remarking, would be

sufficient, if evidence were necessary, to exclude any apprehension of that sort. It results from these remarks that the convention into which we are to enter must contain a provision to the effect that "the engagements" to be made therein are "on the part of Great Britain prospective, and will not invalidate anything already done."

I must, therefore, now discuss the propriety of inserting such a stipulation in the convention which you have been authorized to consummate. The proposed stipulation is divisible into two parts, namely: First. That the engagements of Great Britain are "prospective" [only.]

I do not see any great objection to such an amendment. But why should it be important? A contract is always prospective, and prospective only, if it contains no express stipulation that it shall be retrospective in its operation. So much, therefore, of the stipulation asked is unnecessary, while, if conceded, it might possibly give occasion to misapprehension as to its effect. You will, therefore, decline to make such a condition without first receiving a satisfactory explanation of its meaning and its importance.

The second part of the proposed condition is, that the "engagement will not invalidate anything already done." I am not sure that I should think this proposed condition exceptionable if its effect were clearly understood. It is necessary, however, to go outside of his lordship's letter to find out what is meant by the words "anything already done." If "anything" pertinent to the subject "has been already done" which ought not to be invalidated, it is clear that it must have been done either by the joint action of the United States and Great Britain, or by the United States only, or by Great Britain acting alone. There has been no joint action of the United States and Great Britain upon the subject. The United States have done nothing affecting it; certainly, nothing which they apprehend would be invalidated by the simple form of convention which they propose. I am left to conclude, therefore, that the "thing" which "has been done already," and which Great Britain desires shall not be invalidated by the convention, must be something which she herself has done. At the same time we are left to conjecture what that thing is which is thus to be carefully saved. It would be hazardous on our own part to assume to know, while I have no doubt that the British government, with its accustomed frankness, and in view of the desirableness of a perfect understanding of the matter, will at once specify what the thing which has been done by her, and which is not to be invalidated, really is. You will, therefore, respectfully ask the right honorable secretary for foreign affairs for an explanation of the part of his letter which I have thus drawn under review, as a preliminary to any further proceedings in the proposed negotiation.

You will perform this duty in such a manner as to show that the explanation is asked in no querulous or hypercritical spirit. Secondly, you will perform it with reasonable promptness, so that the attainment of the important object of the negotiation may not be unnecessarily delayed; and, thirdly, you will assure the British government that while the United States, at present, see no reason to think that the stipulation proposed is necessary or expedient, yet, in view of the great interests of commerce and of civilization which are involved, they will refuse nothing which shall be really just or even non-essential and not injurious to themselves, while of course I suppose they are not expected in any way to compromise their own national integrity, safety, or honor.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 3, 1862, p. 17.]

No. 29.

Earl Russell to Earl Cowley.

FOREIGN OFFICE, August 19, 1861.

MY LORD: I transmit to your excellency herewith a copy of a letter which I have addressed to Mr. Adams, the United States minister at this court, respecting the signature of the proposed convention between her Majesty and the United States, adopting the provisions of the declaration of Paris, respecting maritime law, and a copy of the draught declaration which I state to Mr. Adams it is my intention to make on signing the convention.*

Your excellency will communicate these papers to M. Thouvenel.

I am, &c.,

RUSSELL.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 3, 1862, p. 18.]

No. 30.

Earl Cowley to Earl Russell.

[Extract.]

PARIS, August 20, 1861.

Knowing that M. Thouvenel was to see Mr. Dayton this morning, I sent his excellency a copy of your lordship's note and declaration to Mr. Adams with reference to the convention respecting maritime law, as soon as they reached my hands. I have just seen M. Thouvenel, who informed me that he had apprised Mr. Dayton that it was the intention of the imperial government to make a similar declaration to him. Mr. Dayton had thereupon said that he did not think that either he or Mr. Adams could receive such a declaration, without reference to their government. Mr. Dayton hardly concealed from M. Thouvenel that the object of his government in agreeing to sign the convention was to force the western powers to treat the southern privateers as pirates, arguing that as the government of Washington was the only government recognized by foreign powers, the southern States must, as far as foreign powers were concerned, be subject to the consequences of the acts of that government.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

No. 35.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,

Paris, August 22, 1861.

SIR: My anticipations, expressed in dispatch No. 10, are fully realized. Both Lord John Russell and Mr. Thouvenel refuse to negotiate for an accession by the United States to the treaty of Paris of 1856, except on the distinct understanding that it is to have no bearing, directly or indi-

* Note of Earl Russell to Mr. Adams of August 19, 1861, printed with dispatch of Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward of August 23, 1861, post.

rectly, on the question of our southern or domestic difficulty, and to render the matter certain they each propose to make a written declaration simultaneous with the execution of the convention, of which I herewith send you a copy and a translation. I likewise send you a copy of Mr. Thouvenel's note to me with its translation.

I had an interview on Tuesday, the 20th instant, with Mr. Thouvenel, by appointment, in reference to the subject-matter of the convention, and then he gave me the first notice of the purpose of the French government to execute this outside declaration, predicated as it was, beyond all doubt, upon a note he had just received from Lord John Russell, dated only the day preceding. He said that both France and Great Britain had already announced that they would take no part in our domestic controversy, and they thought that a frank and open declaration in advance of the execution of this convention might save difficulty and misconception hereafter. He further said, in the way of specification, that the provisions of the treaty, standing alone, might bind England and France to pursue and punish the privateers of the south as pirates; that they were unwilling to do this, and had already so declared. He said that we could deal with these people as we chose, and they could only express their regrets on the score of humanity if we should deal with them as pirates, but they could not participate in such a course. He said, further, that although both England and France were anxious to have the adhesion of the United States to the declaration of Paris, they would rather dispense with it altogether than be drawn into our domestic controversy. He insisted somewhat pointedly that I could take no just exception to this outside declaration, simultaneous with the execution of the convention, unless we intended they should be made parties to our controversy; and that the very fact of my hesitation was an additional reason why they should insist upon making such contemporaneous declaration. These are the general views expressed by him.

In answer, I assented at once to the propriety of such declaration being made in advance, *if France and England did not mean to abide by the terms of the treaty*. I stated that I had no reason to suppose that the United States desired to embroil these countries in our domestic difficulties; that, in point of fact, our great desire had been that they should keep out of them; but they proposed now to make a declaration to accompany the execution of the convention which they admitted would vary its obligations. That my instructions were to negotiate that convention, and that I had no authority to do anything or listen to anything which would waive any right or relieve from any obligation which might fairly arise from a just construction of its terms. He said they did not mean to alter its terms; that it was not like an addition of other provisions to the terms of the treaty itself. To this I replied, that for the purpose intended, it was precisely the same as if this declaration they proposed to make were to be incorporated into the treaty itself; that its effect was to relieve them (without complaint on our part) from compliance with one of the admitted obligations of the treaty. I then told him I would consult with Mr. Adams, and it was not improbable that we might feel ourselves under the necessity of referring again to our government, to which he answered that that must be a question for us to determine. In the course of our conversation I told him that any declaration or action which looked to or recognized a difference or distinction between the North and South was a matter upon which our government was, under the circumstances, peculiarly sensitive; that we treated with foreign governments for our whole country, North and

South, and for all its citizens, whether true men or rebels, and when we could not so treat, we would cease to treat at all. He answered that they did not mean to contest our right to treat for the whole country, and that was not the purpose of the outside declaration they proposed to make; but having heretofore adopted a course of strict neutrality, the declaration in question was right and proper to prevent misconception and controversy in the future.

After my conference with Mr. Thouvenel closed, I immediately wrote to Mr. Adams, and suggested to him the propriety of either referring again to our government for instructions, or, if he thought that such reference would involve an unnecessary delay, then, at least, that at the time of executing the convention (if it were executed) we should in like manner make a counter declaration in writing, stating, in substance, that "we have no power to admit, and do not mean to admit, that this outside declaration by Great Britain and France is to relieve them, directly or indirectly, from any obligation or duty which would otherwise devolve upon them in virtue of said convention."

I have felt constrained to make these suggestions to Mr. Adams, for I am unwilling to act affirmatively in a matter of so much importance without being clearly within my instructions. I shall await his answer before I communicate further with the French government.

With much respect, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

HON. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Thouvenel to Mr. Dayton.

[Translation.]

PARIS, August 20, 1861.

SIR: I have the honor to communicate to you the text of the written declaration that I propose to myself to make, and of which I will take care to remit to you a copy, at the moment of the signing of the convention designed to render obligatory between France and the United States the principles upon maritime rights proclaimed by the congress of Paris. This declaration has for its object, as you will see, to prevent all misunderstanding upon the nature of the engagements which the government of the Emperor is disposed to contract.

If you were ready to sign the convention contemplated, we might be able to agree to make it the same day when Lord Russell should proceed from his side to the signing of a similar act with Mr. Adams.

Accept the assurances of the high consideration with which I have the honor to be, sir, your very humble and very obedient servant,

THOUVENEL.

MR. DAYTON,
Minister of the United States at Paris.

[Translation.]

Draft of declaration.

In affixing his signature to the convention concluded in date of this day between France and the United States, the undersigned declares, in execution of the orders of the Emperor, that the government of his

Majesty does not intend to undertake, by the said convention, any engagement of a nature to implicate it, directly or indirectly, in the internal conflict now existing in the United States.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 32.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, August 23, 1861.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit a copy of a note addressed to me by Lord Russell, transmitting to me a copy of a declaration which he proposes to make upon signing the convention, embodying the articles of the declaration of Paris, in conjunction with myself.

I have waited to communicate with Mr. Dayton until I now learn from him that Mr. Thouvenel proposes to him a similar movement on the part of France.

This proceeding is of so grave and novel a character as, in my opinion, to render further action inadvisable until I obtain further instructions; and I find Mr. Dayton is of the same opinion on his side. I propose to address a letter to his lordship stating my reasons for declining to proceed as soon as possible, but I fear I shall not have time to get it ready and a copy made in season for the present mail. I shall therefore postpone any further elucidation of my views until the next opportunity. I do so the more readily that I am informed by Mr. Dayton that you have ceased to consider the matter as one of any urgent importance.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Lord Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *August 19, 1861.*

SIR: I have the honor to inclose a copy of a declaration which I propose to make upon signing the convention of which you gave me a draft embodying the articles of the declaration of Paris.

I propose to make the declaration in question in a written form, and to furnish you with a copy of it.

You will observe that it is intended to prevent any misconception as to the nature of the engagement to be taken by her Majesty.

If you have no objection to name a day, in the course of this week, for the signature of the convention, Mr. Dayton can on that day, and at the same time, sign with M. Thouvenel a convention identical with that which you propose to sign with me.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[Inclosure.]

Draft of declaration.

In affixing his signature to the convention of this day, between her Majesty the Queen of Great Britain and Ireland and the United States

of America, the Earl Russell declares, by order of her Majesty, that her Majesty does not intend thereby to undertake any engagement which shall have any bearing, direct or indirect, on the internal differences now prevailing in the United States.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 3, 1862, p. 22.]

No. 33.

Earl Cowley to Earl Russell.

PARIS, August 27, 1861.

MY LORD: I have informed M. Thouvenel that Mr. Adams declines to sign the convention respecting maritime law without further orders. His excellency has heard nothing more from Mr. Dayton.

I have, &c.

COWLEY.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

No. 37.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,

Paris, August 29, 1861.

SIR: Herewith I beg to inclose a copy of a communication made by me to Mr. Thouvenel, in answer to his formal notice of a purpose on the part of the French government to make an outside declaration of its intentions at the time of the execution of the treaty, copies of which were inclosed in dispatch No. 35.

It is in part the same matter suggested to him by me in the conference in which he first notified me of his purpose. His written communication subsequent to that conference required a like formal reply. I am happy to learn from a communication received from Mr. Adams that he concurs with me in the propriety of stopping the negotiation where it is, and referring the matter to the government at home. I should have been most reluctant, under the circumstances, to execute this convention, had Mr. Adams insisted upon it, making only a counter declaration, such as was referred to in dispatch No. 35; but I was very desirous, after what had passed, not to be considered an obstacle in the way of carrying out the wishes of the administration. I doubt now, however, if England and France would themselves have assented to proceed with the execution of the convention in the face of such declaration.

With much respect, I have the honor to be your obedient servant,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Thouvenel.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,

Paris, August 26, 1861.

MONSIEUR LE MINISTRE: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of the 20th instant, in which (carrying out the purpose expressed by you in our prior conversation of that day) you

communicate to me the text of a written declaration which you propose to make simultaneous with the execution of the convention between the United States and France, in reference to the principles upon maritime rights proclaimed by the congress of Paris in 1856. You further suggest, in your note, that if I were ready to sign the convention contemplated, we might be able to agree to do so the same day when Lord Russell should proceed, on his side, to the signing of a like convention with Mr. Adams.

The declaration which you propose to make in writing, simultaneous with the execution of the convention, has for its object, you say, "to prevent all misunderstanding as to the nature of the engagements which the government of the Emperor is disposed to contract," and this declaration is, that "in the execution of the orders of the Emperor the government of his Majesty does not intend to undertake, by said convention, any engagements of a nature to implicate it, directly or indirectly, in the internal conflict now existing in the United States."

My impressions, hastily thrown out when this proposition was verbally suggested, have been strengthened by subsequent reflection. I do not stop to inquire how such outside declaration as you propose may affect the rights or obligations of parties under the treaty. Indeed, it is so general that it may not be possible to anticipate its entire scope or operation. It gives us notice that the engagements of your government are not to be "*of a nature to implicate it directly or indirectly in the internal conflict,*" &c. It may be that the conduct of the government of France, under this declaration, would practically extend no further than would be agreeable to the United States; yet, I cannot act upon such assumption. My instructions are to negotiate a particular convention, the text of which has been examined and approved, as I understand, by your excellency. If the declaration which you propose to make does not alter the obligations or duties which would otherwise devolve upon France, in virtue of that convention, it is useless to make it. If it does alter such obligations or duties; then I am not authorized to execute the convention subject to such declaration. This, indeed, so far as my action at present is concerned, is the whole case. But the subject justifies, and perhaps requires some other remarks. You stated that you thought it more frank and loyal to make your declaration in advance, and in this I entirely concurred. If the treaty without such declaration would impose any duty upon France which she would be unwilling to perform, it was manifestly proper that she should declare her purpose in advance. It was proper, not only for the purpose of preventing misunderstanding as to the nature of her intended engagements, but for the other purposes of leaving to the United States the option of determining, with full knowledge, whether she would or would not enter into the treaty subject to such declaration. The declaration, it is true, is not strictly a part of the treaty; yet, for the purpose intended, its effect and operation would be the same as if it were incorporated into the treaty itself. It will prevent misunderstanding as to the nature of the engagements, or, in other words, it will prevent one party complaining of a non-performance of supposed engagements by the other under the treaty, just as effectually as if it were a condition added to the treaty itself. But for the interposition of this declaration, I should have assented to the execution of the treaty at once; as it is, I have no power to do so.

From this it must not be inferred that there is now, or at any time has been, the slightest wish upon the part of the United States to involve France, or any other foreign government, in its domestic controversy.

The wish, nay, stronger than this, the *right* to be let alone by other nations, has been claimed at all times, so far as I know, by our government and its representative abroad. They have never failed to deprecate, in the most earnest manner, all interference in this question upon the part of foreign powers. Yet the declaration, which it is now proposed to make, would seem to imply that such interference might be claimed by us at the hands of those powers with whom such treaty might be made. I submit, with great respect, that there is nothing in the present position of the United States, or in the past history of this negotiation, which would justify such an inference. When the present administration at Washington came into power it almost immediately gave orders to its representatives abroad to open negotiations upon this general subject; not, it is to be assumed, for any small purpose or object growing out of what they then believed to be a mere temporary insurrection, but with the view to the settlement, so far as their assent could settle the same, of certain great principles of maritime law.

The second and third of those principles, enunciated in the declaration of Paris, has been already proposed and urged upon the attention of other nations by the United States.

The fourth of those principles, which requires that blockades to be respected shall be effective, had never been denied (at least by the United States) as a principle of international or maritime law. It was the first only of the points enunciated in that celebrated declaration about which hesitation existed.

The abandonment of the right, by belligerents, to issue letters of marque and reprisal, under proper restraints, was a serious matter to a country having the extended commerce and limited navy of the United States; yet such abandonment by all nations would, we well knew, tend much to lessen the afflictions incident to war; and so, too, the exemption of property of non-combatants at sea, (except contraband,) as it is on land, would, in a still greater degree, tend to the same end.

Hence the disposition manifested on the part of the United States, on every proper occasion, to connect in its negotiations the two; to make the concession of the one the equivalent, if possible, of the concession of the other. This was the condition of things when the present administration at Washington came into power. Not trammelled by certain considerations which had affected some of their predecessors, they immediately took up the negotiation where it had been left by a prior administration. Ascertaining definitely that the exemption of private property afloat (except contraband) would not be conceded by *all* powers, they assented at once to the execution of a convention, adopting the four principles of the declaration of Paris as they are, without addition and without limitation.

Then, for the first time, we were informed that the government of his Majesty the Emperor (in connection with that of her Britannic Majesty) would only execute such convention subject to a certain condition, which it declares for itself, and of the extent and operation of which it is itself to judge.

I cannot, of course, anticipate with certainty what view the government of the United States may take of this question, but I can scarcely suppose it will assent to the execution of a convention adopting the declaration of Paris, except upon terms of entire reciprocity, and subject to no other condition than those existing by and between the original parties; nor do I believe that it will, in its negotiations with foreign governments, at all assent to exceptions and reservations, verbal or written, predicated upon the existing state of things in that country. It

will, I apprehend, exact no more and be content with no less, than it would have been entitled to had the convention been executed in advance of its present internal controversy. If, therefore, the government of France shall consider that an unconditional execution of that convention will demand of it interference in our affairs, or will implicate it, in any shape, in the civil war now raging in our country, then it is obvious this is not a proper time for her or for us to enter into such agreements.

But these suggestions are made, of course, subject to correction from the government at Washington. To it I shall at once refer the communication of your excellency, together with a copy of the declaration which you have done me the honor to submit upon the part of the French government.

I avail myself of the opportunity to renew to your excellency assurances of the high consideration with which I have the honor to be, sir, your very humble and obedient servant,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Monsieur THOUVENEL,
Ministre des Affaires Étrangères.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 34.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, August 30, 1861.

SIR: It is not without regret that I am compelled to announce the failure of the negotiation which I am led, by the tenor of your dispatches Nos. 55 and 58, to infer you considered almost sure to succeed. I have now the honor to transmit the copy of a note* addressed by me to Lord Russell on the 23d instant, assigning the reasons why I felt it my duty to take the responsibility of declining to fix a day for signing the convention agreed upon between us, burdened, as it was to be, with a contemporaneous exposition of one of its provisions in the form of an outside declaration, made by his lordship on behalf of her Majesty the Queen. I have gone so fully into the matter in that note, as to render further explanation unnecessary. At the same time, I take the liberty to observe that, in case the President should be of opinion that too much stress has been laid by me upon the objectionable character of that paper, an opening has been left by me for the resumption of the negotiation at any moment under new instructions modifying my views. I transmitted to Mr. Dayton a copy for his information immediately after the original was sent. I have not received any later intelligence from him; but I do not doubt that he will forward to the department, by this mail, his representation of the state of the corresponding negotiation at Paris, so that the whole subject will be under your eye at the same moment. From the tenor of his last note to me, I was led to infer that M. Thouvenel contemplated a parallel proceeding in the conclusion of his negotiation, and that he regarded it there very much in the same light that I did here.

From a review of the whole course of these proceedings, I am led to infer the existence of some influence in the cabinet here adverse to the success of this negotiation. At the time of my last conference with

* For reply of Lord Russell to this note see inclosure to Mr. Adams's dispatch No. 39, September 7, 1861, *post*.

Lord Russell I had every reason, from his manner, to believe that he considered the offer of the project as perfectly satisfactory. The suggestion of a qualification did not make its appearance until after the consultation with his colleagues, when it showed itself, first in the enigmatical sentence of his note to me of the 31st of July, of which, in my dispatch No. 22 to the department, I confessed my inability to comprehend the meaning, and afterwards in the formal announcement contained in his note of the 19th of August. That the failure of the measure, by reason of it, could not have been altogether unexpected, I infer from Mr. Dayton's report to me of M. Thouvenel's language to him, to the effect that his government would prefer to lose the negotiation rather than to omit making the exception. * * * * *

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

HON. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, August 23, 1861.

The undersigned, envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States, has the honor to acknowledge the reception of the note of the 19th instant, of Lord Russell, her Majesty's principal secretary of state for foreign affairs, covering the copy of a declaration which his lordship proposes to make upon signing the convention which has been agreed upon between her Majesty the Queen of Great Britain and Ireland and the United States of America, embodying the articles of the declaration of Paris, and at the same time requesting him to name a day in the course of this week for the signature of the convention, in conjunction with a similar proceeding, to be arranged to take place at Paris, between Mr. Dayton and the minister of foreign affairs on the part of the French government.

The first step rendered necessary by this proposal was that the undersigned should communicate with Mr. Dayton, in order to know whether a similar declaration was contemplated on the part of the Emperor of the French, and, in case it was, whether Mr. Dayton was still prepared to proceed. Mr. Dayton's letter containing that information was received only yesterday, which fact, in conjunction with a brief absence of the undersigned, will account for the apparent delay in answering his lordship's note.

In order perfectly to understand the position of the undersigned, it will be necessary briefly to recapitulate the particulars of this negotiation. But a few weeks after the accession of the President of the United States to office, his attention was turned to the state in which the negotiation on the subject of the four articles of the declaration of Paris had been left by his predecessor; and his disposition manifested itself to remove, so far as he could, the obstacles which had been interposed in the way of completing it. To that end, among the duties with which the undersigned was charged immediately upon his arrival at his post, was an instruction at once to make overtures to her Majesty's government for a revival of the negotiation here. And, in case of the manifestation of a favorable disposition, he was further directed to offer a project of a convention, which he was properly empowered to sign, after

satisfying himself that the incorporation of the amendment which had been proposed by Mr. Marcy, for the government of the United States, at a former stage of the proceedings, was not attainable.

On the 18th of May last, being the day of the first interview had with his lordship, the subject was only opened by the undersigned as one on which he had power to negotiate, and the disposition of her Majesty's government to proceed here was tested. It was then that he received a distinct impression from his lordship that the matter had been already committed to the care of Lord Lyons at Washington, with authority to agree with the government of the United States on the basis of the adoption of three of the articles, and the omission of the fourth altogether. Considering this to be equivalent to declining a negotiation here, and at the same time relieving him from a duty which would be better performed by his own government, the undersigned cheerfully acquiesced in this suggestion, and accordingly wrote home signifying his intention not to renew the subject, unless again specifically instructed so to do.

One month passed away, when the Secretary of State of the United States, after a conference with Lord Lyons, learning that his lordship did not confirm the representation of the powers with which the undersigned had understood him to be clothed, and, so far from it, that he did not feel authorized to enter into any convention at all at Washington, directed the undersigned to inform the government in London of this fact, and to propose once more to enter into convention, if agreeable here.

Immediately upon the receipt of these instructions, the undersigned wrote a letter on the 11th of July, as his lordship may remember, reciting these facts and renewing the question whether a proposal of negotiation at this place would be acceptable to her Majesty's government. To this letter a favorable reply was received on the 13th, and an interview took place the same day, at which, after ascertaining that the amendment desired by his government would not be successful, the undersigned had the honor to present to his lordship the project in the same form in which it had been, nearly two months before, placed in his hands, and in which it has been since accepted, and to offer a copy of his powers to negotiate. His lordship, after examining the former, remarked that he would take it for consultation with his colleagues, and in the mean time that there was no necessity for a copy of the powers.

The next step in the negotiation was the receipt, by the undersigned, of a letter from his lordship, dated the 18th of July, calling his attention to the fact that the declaration of Paris contemplated a concurrence of various powers, and not an insulated engagement of two powers only, and requiring an assurance that the United States were ready to enter into a similar engagement with France and with other maritime powers, parties to the declaration, and not with Great Britain alone. But, inasmuch as this process itself might involve the loss of much time, that her Majesty's government would deem themselves authorized to advise the Queen to conclude a convention with the President of the United States so soon as they should have been informed that a similar convention has been agreed upon between the President and the Emperor of the French.

Upon receiving this reply the undersigned, not unwilling to do everything within his power to forward an object considered by him of the greatest value, immediately opened a correspondence with Mr. Dayton, the representative of the United States at Paris, to learn from him whether such an arrangement as that contemplated in his lordship's note

could not be at once carried out by him. With some reluctance, Mr. Dayton consented to promote it, but only upon the production of evidence satisfactory to his own mind that the amendment originally proposed by Mr. Marcy was not attainable. The undersigned then addressed himself to his lordship, and with entire success. The evidence was obtained, Mr. Dayton acted with success, and no further difficulties then seemed to be in the way of a speedy and simultaneous affirmation of concurrence in the principles of the declaration of Paris by the United States, in conjunction with the other powers.

The public law thus declared to be established embraced four general propositions, to wit:

1. Privateering is abolished.
2. The neutral flag covers enemy's goods, except contraband of war.
3. Neutral goods safe under an enemy's flag, with the same exception.
4. Blockades, to be binding, must be effective.

The government of the United States, in proposing to join in the establishment of these principles, are believed by the undersigned to be acting with the single purpose of aiding to establish a permanent doctrine for all time. Convinced of the value of it in ameliorating the horrors of warfare all over the globe, they have, perhaps against their notions of their immediate interest, consented to waive temporary considerations of expediency for the attainment of a great ultimate good. They are at last prepared to sign and seal an engagement pure and simple, and by so doing to sacrifice the hope of attaining, at least for the present, an improvement of it to which they have always attached great value. But just at the moment when their concurrence with the views of the other maritime powers of the world would seem to be certain, they are met with a proposition from one, if not more, of the parties, to accompany the act with a proceeding somewhat novel and anomalous in this case, being the presentation of a written declaration, not making a part of the convention itself, but intended to follow the signature, to the effect that "her Majesty does not intend thereby to undertake any engagement which shall have any bearing, direct or indirect, on the internal differences now prevailing in the United States."

Obviously, a consent to accept a particular exception, susceptible of so wide a construction of a joint instrument, made by one of the parties to it in its own favor at the time of signing, would justify the idea that some advantage is, or may be suspected to be, intended to be taken by the other. The natural effect of such an accompaniment would seem to be to imply that the government of the United States might be desirous, at this time, to take a part in the declaration, not from any high purpose or durable policy, but with the view of securing some small temporary object in the unhappy struggle which is going on at home. Such an inference would spoil all the value that might be attached to the act itself. The mere toleration of it would seem to be equivalent to a confession of their own weakness. Rather than that such a record should be made, it were a thousand times better that the declaration remain unsigned forever. If the parties to the instrument are not to sign it upon terms of perfect reciprocity, with all their duties and obligations under it perfectly equal, and without equivocation or reservation of any kind, on any side, then it is plain that the proper season for such an engagement has not yet arrived. It were much wiser to put it off until nations can understand each other better.

There is another reason why the undersigned cannot, at this moment, consent to proceed under the powers conferred on him to complete this negotiation when clogged with such a declaration, which is drawn from

the peculiar construction of the government of his own country. By the terms of the Constitution, every treaty negotiated by the President of the United States must, before it is ratified, be submitted to the consideration of the Senate of the United States. The question immediately arises in this case, what is to be done with a declaration like that which his lordship proposes to make. Is it a part of the treaty, or is it not? If it be, then is the undersigned exceeding his instructions in signing it, for the paper made no part of the project which he was directed to propose; and in case he should sign, the addition must be submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent, together with the paper itself. If it be not, what advantage can the party making the declaration expect from it in modifying the construction of the project, when the Senate have never had it before them for their approval? It either changes the treaty or it does not. If it does, then the question arises, why did not the undersigned procure it to be incorporated into it? On the other hand, if it do not, why did he connive at the appearance of a desire to do it without effecting the object?

The undersigned has ever been desirous of maintaining and perpetuating the most friendly relations between her Majesty's kingdom and the United States, and he continues to act in the same spirit when he deprecates the submission of any project clogged with a similar exception to the consideration of the Senate of the United States. He has reason to believe that already a strong disinclination exists in that body to the acceptance of the first of the four propositions embraced in the declaration itself, and that mainly because it is esteemed to be too much of a concession to the great maritime powers. Were he now to consent, without further instructions, to accept a qualification which would scarcely fail to be regarded by many unfavorably disposed persons as more or less directly an insult to the nation in its present distress, he should deem himself as incurring the hazard of bringing on difficulties which he professes an earnest wish to avoid.

For the reasons thus given the undersigned has reluctantly come to the conclusion to decline to fix a day for proceeding in the negotiation under its present aspect, at least until he shall have been able to submit the whole question once more to the judgment of the authorities under which he has the honor to act.

A copy of this letter will also be forwarded to Mr. Dayton for his information.

The undersigned prays Lord Russell to receive the assurances of the most distinguished consideration with which he is his obedient servant.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 3, 1862, p. 22.]

No. 35.

Earl Russell to Earl Cowley.

FOREIGN OFFICE, August 31, 1861.

MY LORD: With reference to my dispatch of the 19th instant, I transmit to you herewith a copy of a note from the United States minister at this court,* upon the subject of the declaration which I proposed to make

* Mr. Adams to Lord Russell of August 23, 1861, printed with Mr. Adams's dispatch to Mr. Seward, No. 34, *ante*.

upon signing the convention which had been agreed upon between her Majesty and the United States of America, embodying the articles of the declaration of Paris of 1856 relative to maritime rights.

I also inclose a copy of the answer which I have returned to Mr. Adams.*

I am, &c.,

RUSSELL.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 83.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, September 7, 1861.

SIR: I have received your dispatch of August 23, No. 32. It is accompanied by a note which was addressed to you by Lord Russell on the 19th of the same month, and a paper containing the form of an official declaration which he proposes to make on the part of her Majesty on the occasion of affixing his signature to the projected convention between the United States and Great Britain for the accession of the former power to the articles of the declaration of the congress of Paris for the melioration of the rigor of international law in regard to neutrals in maritime war. The instrument thus submitted to us by Lord Russell is in the following words: "Draft of declaration.—In affixing his signature to the convention of this day, between her Majesty the Queen of Great Britain and Ireland and the United States of America, the Earl Russell declares, by order of her Majesty, that her Majesty does not intend thereby to undertake any engagement which shall have any bearing, direct or indirect, on the internal differences now prevailing in the United States."

Lord Russell, in his note to you, explains the object of the instrument by saying that it is intended to prevent any misconception as to the nature of the engagement to be taken by her Majesty.

You have judged very rightly in considering this proceeding, on the part of the British government, as one so grave and so novel in its character as to render further action on your part in regard to the projected convention inadmissible until you shall have special instruction from this department.

Long before the present communication can reach you, my instruction of August 17, No. 61, will have come to your hands. That paper directed you to ask Lord Russell to explain a passage in a note written to you, and then lying before me, in which he said: "I need scarcely add that on the part of Great Britain the engagement (to be contained in the projected convention) will be prospective, and will not invalidate anything already done;" which explanation I stated would be expected as a preliminary before you could proceed further in the transaction.

You have thus been already prepared for the information that your resolution to await special instructions in the present emergency is approved.

I feel myself at liberty, perhaps bound, to assume that Lord Russell's proposed declaration, which I have herein recited, will have been already regarded, as well by him as by yourself, as sufficiently answering the request for preliminary explanations which you were instructed to make.

I may, therefore, assume that the case is fully before me, and that the

* Earl Russell to Mr. Adams of August 23, 1861, printed with Mr. Adams's dispatch to Mr. Seward No. 39, *post*.

question whether this government will consent to enter into the projected treaty with Great Britain, subject to the condition of admitting the simultaneous declaration on her Majesty's part, proposed by Lord Russell, is ready to be decided.

I am instructed by the President to say that the proposed declaration is inadmissible.

It would be virtually a new and distinct article incorporated into the projected convention. To admit such a new article would, for the first time in the history of the United States, be to permit a foreign power to take cognizance of and adjust its relations upon assumed internal and purely domestic differences existing within our own country.

This broad consideration supersedes any necessity for considering in what manner or in what degree the projected convention, if completed either subject to the explanation proposed or not, would bear directly or indirectly on the internal differences which the British government assume to be prevailing in the United States.

I do not enlarge upon this branch of the subject. It is enough to say that the view thus adopted by the President seems to be in harmony equally with a prudent regard to the safety of the republic and a just sense of its honor and dignity.

The proposed declaration is made inadmissible, among other reasons, because it is not mutual. It proposes a special rule by which her Majesty's obligations shall be meliorated in their bearing upon internal difficulties now prevailing in the United States, while the obligations to be assumed by the United States shall not be similarly meliorated or at all affected in their bearing on internal differences that may now be prevailing, or may hereafter arise and prevail, in Great Britain.

It is inadmissible, because it would be a substantial and even a radical departure from the declaration of the congress at Paris. That declaration makes no exception in favor of any of the parties to it in regard to the bearing of their obligations upon internal differences which may prevail in the territories or dominions of other parties.

The declaration of the congress of Paris is the joint act of forty-six great and enlightened powers, designing to alleviate the evils of maritime war, and promote the first interest of humanity, which is peace. The government of Great Britain will not, I am sure, expect us to accede to this noble act otherwise than upon the same equal footing upon which all the other parties to it are standing. We could not consent to accede to the declaration with a modification of its terms unless all the present parties to it should stipulate that the modification should be adopted as one of universal application. The British government cannot but know that there would be little prospect of an entire reformation of the declaration of Paris at the present time, and it has not even told us that it would accept the modification as a general one if it were proposed.

It results that the United States must accede to the declaration of the congress of Paris on the same terms with all the other parties to it, or that they do not accede to it at all.

You will present these considerations to Lord Russell, not as arguments why the British government ought to recede from the position it has assumed, but as the grounds upon which the United States decline to enter into the projected convention recognizing that exceptional position of her Majesty.

If, therefore, her Britannic Majesty's government shall adhere to the proposition thus disallowed, you will inform Lord Russell that the negotiation must for the present be suspended.

I forbear, purposely, from a review of the past correspondence, to

ascertain the relative responsibilities of the parties for this failure of negotiations, from which I had hoped results would flow beneficial, not only to the two nations, but to the whole world—beneficial, not in the present age only, but in future ages.

It is my desire that we may withdraw from the subject carrying away no feelings of passion, prejudice, or jealousy, so that in some happier time it may be resumed, and the important objects of the proposed convention may be fully secured. I believe that that propitious time is even now not distant; and I will hope that when it comes Great Britain will not only willingly and unconditionally accept the adhesion of the United States to all the benignant articles of the declaration of the congress of Paris, but will even go further, and, relinquishing her present objections, consent, as the United States have so constantly invited, that the private property, not contraband, of citizens and subjects of nations in collision shall be exempted from confiscation, equally in warfare waged on the land and in warfare waged upon the seas, which are the common highways of all nations.

Regarding this negotiation as at an end, the question arises, What, then, are to be the views and policy of the United States in regard to the rights of neutrals in maritime war in the present case? My previous dispatches leave no uncertainty upon this point. We regard Great Britain as a friend. Her Majesty's flag, according to our traditional principles, covers enemy's goods not contraband of war. Goods of her Majesty's subjects, not contraband of war, are exempt from confiscation, though found under a neutral or disloyal flag. No depredations shall be committed by our naval forces, or by those of any of our citizens, so far as we can prevent it, upon the vessels or property of British subjects. Our blockade, being effective, must be respected.

The unfortunate failure of our negotiations to amend the law of nations in regard to maritime war does not make us enemies, although, if they had been successful, we should have perhaps been more assured friends.

Civil war is a calamity from which certainly no people or nation that has ever existed has been always exempt. It is one which probably no nation ever will escape. Perhaps its most injurious trait is its tendency to subvert the good understanding and break up the relations existing between the distracted state and friendly nations, and to involve them, sooner or later, in war. It is the desire of the United States that the internal differences existing in this country may be confined within our own borders. I do not suffer myself for a moment to doubt that Great Britain has a desire that we may be successful in attaining that object, and that she looks with dread upon the possibility of being herself drawn into this unhappy internal controversy of our own. I do not think it can be regarded as disrespectful if you should remind Lord Russell that when, in 1838, a civil war broke out in Canada, a part of the British dominions adjacent to the United States, the Congress of the United States passed, and the President executed, a law which effectually prevented any intervention against the government of Great Britain in those internal differences by American citizens, whatever might be their motives, real or pretended, whether of interest or sympathy. I send you a copy of that enactment. The British government will judge for itself whether it is suggestive of any measures on the part of Great Britain that might tend to preserve the peace of the two countries, and, through that way, the peace of all nations.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extracts.]

No. 39.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, September 7, 1861.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the reception of dispatches from the department, numbered from 61 to 67, both inclusive.

Since the date of your No. 61, of the 17th of August, you will have learned ere this that the enigmatical extract from Lord Russell's note to me, of which you instructed me to ask an explanation, has taken a very distinct and unequivocal shape, superseding all necessity for further inquiry. I may take occasion to remark upon the similarity of some of the reasoning in your dispatch with that which you will find already made use of in my letter to his lordship of the 23d August, declining to conclude the negotiation. On the whole, it seems to me that it is perhaps as well to let it stay for the present in the situation in which her Majesty's ministers have placed it. But in this I remain to be directed at the pleasure of the President.

In this connection, I have the honor to transmit a copy of Lord Russell's note of the 28th of August, in reply to mine of the 23d of that month to him, already referred to in the preceding paragraph. I likewise send a copy of his instructions to Lord Lyons, which he seems to have furnished to me as an evidence of his good faith in the representation he made of them to me at the conference.

* * * * *

It now appears plainly enough that he wanted, from the first, to get the first article of the declaration of Paris out of the negotiation altogether if he could. But he did not say a word of this to me at the outset; neither was it consistent with the position hitherto taken respecting the necessity of accepting the declaration "pure and simple." What I recollect him to have said on the 18th of May was, that it had been the disposition of his government, as communicated to Lord Lyons, to agree upon almost any terms respecting the first article that might suit the government of the United States. When reminded of this afterwards, he modified the statement to mean that the article might be omitted altogether. It now turns out, if we may judge from the instructions, that he did not precisely say either the one thing or the other. Substantially, indeed, he might mean that the general law of nations, if affirmed between the two governments, would, to a certain extent, attain the object of the first article of the declaration of Paris without the adoption of it as a new principle. But he must have known, on the day of the date of these instructions, *which is the very day of his first conference with me*, and four days after the issue of the Queen's proclamation, that the government of the United States contemplated, in the pending struggle, neither encouraging privateers nor issuing letters of marque; hence that such a proposition would only complicate the negotiation for no useful purpose whatever. Besides which, it should be borne in mind, that the effect, if adopted, would have been, instead of a simple adhesion to the declaration of Paris, to render it necessary to reopen a series of negotiations for a modification of it between all the numerous parties to that instrument. Moreover it is admitted by his lordship that no powers had been given to make any convention at all—the parties could only agree. Yet, without such powers, what was the value of an agreement? For the declaration of Paris was by its very terms

binding only between parties who acceded to it as a whole. Her Majesty's government thus placed themselves in the position of a party which proposes what it gives no authority to perform, and which negotiates upon a basis on which it has already deprived itself of the power to conclude.

How are we to reconcile these inconsistencies? By the terms of the Queen's proclamation his lordship must have been aware that Great Britain had released the United States from further responsibility for the acts of its new-made belligerent that was issuing letters of marque, as well as from the possible offenses of privateers sailing under its flag; and yet, when the government of the United States comes forward and declares its disposition to accept the terms of the declaration of Paris, pure and simple, the government of her Majesty cannot consent to receive the very thing that they have been all along asking for, because it might possibly compel them to deny to certain privateers the rights which may accrue to them by virtue of their voluntary recognition of them as belonging to a belligerent power. Yet it now appears that on the 18th of May the same government was willing to reaffirm the law of nations, which virtually involved the very same difficulty on the one hand, while on the other it had given no powers to negotiate a new convention, but contemplated a simple adhesion to the old declaration on the part of the United States. The only way by which I can explain these various involutions of policy with a proper regard to Lord Russell's character for straight-forwardness, which I have no disposition to impugn, is this: He may have instructed Lord Lyons prior to the 18th of May, the day of our first conference. I certainly received the impression that he had done so. Or he may have written the paper before one o'clock of that day, and thus have referred to the act as a thing completed, though still within his power, in order to get rid of the proposition to negotiate directly here. Of that I do not pretend to judge. But neither in one case nor in the other was there the smallest intimation of a desire to put in any caveat whatever of the kind proposed in his last declaration. That seems to have been an afterthought, suggested when all other obstacles to the success of a negotiation had been removed.

That it originated with Lord Russell I cannot credit consistently with my great respect for his character.

That it was suggested after his proposed consultation with his colleagues, and by some member who had in view the defeat of the negotiation in the interest of the insurgents, I am strongly inclined to believe. The same influence may have been at work in the earlier stages of the business as well as the latest, and have communicated that uncertain and indirect movement which I have commented on, not less inconsistent with all my notions of his lordship's character than with the general reputation of British policy.

I have not deemed it necessary to make any reply to his lordship's letter. My correspondence with him has, under the instructions conveyed by your late dispatches, taken another form, which, seems to demand more immediate attention.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

P. S.—On a closer examination of the copy of his lordship's instructions, as sent to me from the Foreign Office, I find an indorsement on

the back of it which gives a date different from that placed at the head of the paper. I transmit the copy exactly as it appears on that sent to me. It makes a difference of four days, and puts the composition on the day of my arrival in London, and the day before the issue of the Queen's proclamation, when he must equally have been the master of its contents. My view is not, therefore, materially affected by the adoption of either date.

C. F. A.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, August 28, 1861.

The undersigned, her Majesty's principal secretary of state for foreign affairs, has had the honor to receive the note, of the 23d instant, of Mr. Adams, envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States.

Mr. Adams has accounted satisfactorily for the delay in answering the note of the undersigned of the 19th instant. Her Majesty's government in all these transactions has acted in concert with the government of the Emperor of the French, and the undersigned cannot be surprised that Mr. Adams should wish to communicate with Mr. Dayton, at Paris, before replying to his note.

The undersigned is quite prepared, following Mr. Adams, to recapitulate the particulars of this negotiation, and he is happy to think that in matters of fact there is no ground for any controversy between them. He need only supply some omissions.

Mr. Adams, at his first interview with the undersigned, on the 18th of May last, mentioned the subject of the declaration of Paris as one on which he had power to negotiate, and the undersigned then told him that the matter had been already committed to the care of Lord Lyons, at Washington, with authority to agree with the government of the United States on the basis of the adoption of three of the articles and the omission of the first, being that relating to privateering. So far, the statement of Mr. Adams agrees substantially with that which is here made. But the representation of the undersigned was strictly accurate, and in faith of it he subjoins the dispatch by which Lord Lyons was authorized to negotiate on the basis of the three latter articles of the declaration of Paris. Lord Lyons, however, was not empowered to sign a convention, because that form had not been adopted by the powers who originally signed the declaration, nor by any of the numerous states which afterwards gave their adherence to its articles.

At a later period, when Mr. Adams brought a copy of his full powers to the foreign office, the undersigned asked why the adherence of the United States should not be given in the same form as that of other powers, and he was told, in reply, that as the Constitution of the United States required the consent of the Senate to any agreement with foreign powers, that agreement must necessarily, or at least would most conveniently, be made in the shape of a convention.

The undersigned yielded to this argument, and proposed to the government of the Emperor of the French, with which her Majesty's government had been acting throughout in complete agreement, to concur likewise in this departure from the form in which the declaration of Paris had been adopted by the maritime powers of Europe.

But the British government could not sign the convention proposed by the United States as an act of Great Britain singly and alone, and

they found to their surprise that in case of France and of some of the other European powers, the addition of Mr. Marcy relating to private property at sea had been proposed by the ministers of the United States at the courts of those powers.

The undersigned concurs in the statement made by Mr. Adams respecting the transactions which followed. Her Majesty's government, like Mr. Adams, wished to establish a doctrine for all time, with a view to lessen the horrors of war all over the globe. The instructions sent to Lord Lyons prove the sincerity of their wish to give permanence and fixity of principles to this part of the law of nations.

The undersigned has now arrived at that part of the subject upon which the negotiation is interrupted.

The undersigned has notified Mr. Adams of his intention to accompany his signature of the proposed convention with a declaration to the effect that "her Majesty does not intend thereby to undertake any engagement which shall have any bearing, direct or indirect, on the internal differences now prevailing in the United States."

The reasons for this course can be easily explained. On some recent occasions, as on the fulfillment of the treaty of 1846, respecting the boundary, and with respect to the treaty called by the name of the "Clayton-Bulwer treaty," serious differences have arisen with regard to the precise meaning of words, and the intention of those who framed them.

It was most desirable in framing a new agreement not to give rise to a fresh dispute. But the different attitude of Great Britain and of the United States in regard to the internal dissensions now unhappily prevailing in the United States gave warning that such a dispute might arise out of the proposed convention.

Her Majesty's government, upon receiving intelligence that the President had declared by proclamation his intention to blockade the ports of nine of the States of the Union, and that Mr. Davis, speaking in the name of those nine States, had declared his intention to issue letters of marque and reprisals, and having also received certain information of the design of both sides to arm, had come to the conclusion that civil war existed in America, and her Majesty had thereupon proclaimed her neutrality in the approaching contest.

The government of the United States, on the other hand, spoke only of unlawful combinations, and designated those concerned in them as rebels and pirates. It would follow logically and consistently, from the attitude taken by her Majesty's government, that the so-called Confederate States, being acknowledged as a belligerent, might, by the law of nations, arm privateers, and that their privateers must be regarded as the armed vessels of a belligerent.

With equal logic and consistency it would follow from the position taken by the United States, that the privateers of the southern States might be deemed to be pirates, and it might be further argued by the government of the United States that a European power signing a convention with the United States, declaring that privateering was and remains abolished, would be bound to treat the privateers of the so-called Confederate States as pirates.

Hence, instead of an agreement, charges of bad faith and violation of a convention might be brought in the United States against the power signing such a convention, and treating the privateers of the so-called Confederate States as those of a belligerent power.

The undersigned had at first intended to make verbally the declaration proposed. But he considered it would be more clear, more open,

more fair to Mr. Adams to put the declaration in writing, and to give notice of it to Mr. Adams before signing the convention.

The undersigned will not now reply to the reasons given by Mr. Adams for not signing the convention if accompanied by the proposed declaration. Her Majesty's government wish the question to be fairly weighed by the United States government. The undersigned, like Mr. Adams, wishes to maintain and perpetuate the most friendly relations between her Majesty's kingdom and the United States. It is in this spirit that her Majesty's government decline to bind themselves without a clear explanation on their part to a convention which, seemingly confined to an adoption of the declaration of Paris of 1856, might be construed as an engagement to interfere in the unhappy dissensions now prevailing in the United States—an interference which would be contrary to her Majesty's public declarations, and would be a reversal of the policy which her Majesty has deliberately sanctioned.

The undersigned requests Mr. Adams to accept the assurance of his highest consideration.

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Earl Russell to Lord Lyons.

No. 136.]

FOREIGN OFFICE, May 18, 1861.

MY LORD: Her Majesty's government deeply lament the outbreak of hostilities in North America, and they would gladly lend their aid to the restoration of peace.

You are instructed, therefore, in case you should be asked to employ your good offices either singly or in conjunction with the representatives of other powers, to give your assistance in promoting the work of reconciliation. But as it is most probable; especially after a recent letter of Mr. Seward, that foreign advice is not likely to be accepted, you will refrain from offering it unasked. Such being the case, and supposing the contest not to be at once ended by signal success on one side or by the return of friendly feeling between the two contending parties, her Majesty's government have to consider what will be the position of Great Britain as a neutral between the two belligerents.

So far as the position of Great Britain in this respect toward the European powers is concerned, that position has been greatly modified by the declaration of Paris of April 16, 1856. That declaration was signed by the ministers of Austria, France, Great Britain, Prussia, Russia, Sardinia, and Turkey.

The motives for making that declaration, and for agreeing to the articles of maritime law which it proposes to introduce with a view to the establishment of a "uniform doctrine" and "fixed principles," are thus shortly enumerated in the declaration:

"Considering that maritime law in time of war has long been the subject of deplorable disputes;

"That the uncertainty of the law and of the duties in such a matter gives rise to differences of opinion between neutrals and belligerents which may occasion serious difficulties and even conflicts;

"That it is consequently advantageous to establish a uniform doctrine on so important a point;

"That the plenipotentiaries assembled in congress at Paris cannot better respond to the intentions by which their governments are ani-

mated than by seeking to introduce into international relations fixed principles in this respect—

"The above-mentioned plenipotentiaries, being duly authorized, resolved to concert among themselves as to the means of attaining this object, and having come to an agreement have adopted the following solemn declaration :—"

1st. Privateering is and remains abolished.

2d. The neutral flag covers enemy's goods, with the exception of contraband of war.

3d. Neutral's goods, with the exception of contraband of war, are not liable to capture under enemy's flag.

4th: Blockades, in order to be binding, must be effective—that is to say, maintained by a force sufficient really to prevent access to the coast of the enemy.

The powers signing the declaration engaged to bring it to the knowledge of the states which had not taken part in the congress of Paris, and to invite those states to accede to it. They finally agreed that "the present declaration is not and shall not be binding, except between those powers who have acceded or shall accede to it."

The powers which acceded to the declaration are Baden, Bavaria, Belgium, Bremen, Brazil, Duchy of Brunswick, Chili, the Argentine Confederation, the Germanic Confederation, Denmark, the Two Sicilies, the Republic of the Equator, the Roman States, Greece, Guatemala, Hayti, Hamburg, Hanover, the Two Hesses, Lubeck, Mecklenburg-Strelitz, Mecklenburg-Schwerin, Nassau, Oldenburg, Parma, Holland, Peru, Portugal, Saxony, Saxe-Altenburg, Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, Saxe-Meiningen, Saxe-Weimer, Sweden, Switzerland, Tuscany, Wurtemberg, Anhalt, Dessau, Modena, New Granada, and Uruguay.

Mr. Secretary Marcy, in acknowledging, on the 28th of July, 1856, the communication of the declaration of Paris made to the government of the United States by the Count de Sartiges, proposed to add to the first article thereof the following words : "and that the private property of the subjects or citizens of a belligerent on the high seas shall be exempted from seizure by public armed vessels of the other belligerents, except it be contraband;" and Mr. Marcy expressed the willingness of the government of the United States to adopt the clause so amended, together with the other three principles contained in the declaration.

Mr. Marcy also stated that he was directed to communicate the approval of the President of the second, third and fourth propositions, independently of the first, should the proposed amendment of the first article be unacceptable.

The United States minister in London, on the 24th of February, 1857, renewed the proposal in regard to the first article, and submitted a draft of convention, in which the article so amended would be embodied with the other three articles. But, before any decision was taken on this proposal, a change took place in the American government by the election of a new President of the United States, and Mr. Dallas announced, on the 25th of April, 1857, that he was directed to suspend negotiations on the subject; up to the present time those negotiations have not been renewed.

The consequence is, that the United States remaining outside the provisions of the declaration of Paris, the uncertainty of the law and of international duties with regard to such matters may give rise to differences of opinion between neutrals and belligerents which may occasion serious difficulties and even conflicts.

It is with a view to remove beforehand such "difficulties," and to prevent such "conflicts," that I now address you.

For this purpose I proceed to remark on the four articles, beginning, not with the first, but with the last.

In a letter to the Earl of Clarendon of the 24th of February, 1857, Mr. Dallas, the minister of the United States, while submitting the draft of a new convention, explains the views of the government of the United States on the four articles.

In reference to the last article, he says: "The fourth of those principles, respecting blockades, had, it is believed, long since become a fixed rule of the law of war."

There can be no difference of opinion, therefore, with regard to the fourth article.

With respect to the third article, the principle laid down in it has long been recognized as law, both in Great Britain and in the United States. Indeed, this part of the law is stated by Chancellor Kent to be uniform in the two countries.

With respect to the second article, Mr. Dallas says, in the letter before quoted: "About two years prior to the meeting of congress at Paris, negotiations had been originated and were in train with the maritime nations for the adoption of the second and third propositions substantially as enumerated in the declaration."

The United States have therefore no objection in principle to the second proposition.

Indeed, her Majesty's government have to remark that this principle is adopted in the treaties between the United States and Russia of the 22d of July, 1854, and was sanctioned by the United States in the earliest period of the history of their independence by their accession to the armed neutrality.

With Great Britain the case has been different. She formerly contended for the opposite principles as the established rule of the law of nations.

But having, in 1856, upon full consideration, determined to depart from that rule, she means to adhere to the principles she then adopted. The United States, who have always desired this change, can, it may be presumed, have no difficulty in assenting to the principle set forth in the second article of the declaration of Paris.

There remains only to be considered the first article, namely, that relating to privateering, from which the government of the United States withhold their assent. Under these circumstances it is expedient to consider what is required on this subject by the general law of nations. Now, it must be borne in mind that privateers bearing the flag of one or other of the belligerents may be manned by lawless and abandoned men, who may commit, for the sake of plunder, the most destructive and sanguinary outrages.

There can be no question but that the commander and crew of the ship bearing a letter of marque must, by law of nations, carry on their hostilities according to the established laws of war. Her Majesty's government must, therefore, hold any government issuing such letters of marque responsible for, and liable to make good, any losses sustained by her Majesty's subjects in consequence of wrongful proceeding of vessels sailing under such letters of marque.

In this way the object of the declaration of Paris may, to a certain extent, be attained without the adoption of any new principle.

You will urge these views upon Mr. Seward.

The proposals of her Majesty's government are made with a view to

limit and restrain that destruction of property and that interruption of trade which must, in a greater or less degree, be the inevitable consequence of the present hostilities. Her Majesty's government expect that these proposals will be received by the United States government in a friendly spirit. If such shall be the case, you will endeavor (in concert with M. Mercier) to come to an agreement on the subject binding France, Great Britain, and the United States.

If these proposals should, however, be rejected, her Majesty's government will consider what other steps should be taken with a view to protect from wrong and injury the trade and the property and persons of British subjects.

I am, &c., &c., &c.,

J. RUSSELL.

The Lord LYONS.

[On the copy of the above dispatch given Mr. Adams, as transmitted to the State Department, is indorsed, "To Lord Lyons, No. 136, Foreign Office, May 13, 1861."]

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 44.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, September 7, 1861.

SIR: Your dispatches, 41, 42, and 43, are duly received through Captain Schultz.

Your action, indicated in 41 and 42, has been anticipated by me. In a letter from Mr. Adams, dated London, August 1, 1861, he incloses me a copy of Lord John Russell's note of July 31, 1861, and in reference to the vague paragraph to which your dispatches refer he says: "I do not quite comprehend the drift of the last paragraph, but I presume you may find it out in the progress of your negotiation." This I immediately answered by a letter, of which I herewith send you a copy.

Their subsequent offer to make a written outside declaration coterminous with the execution of the treaty was a degree of frankness which I did not anticipate, and for which I had not given them credit. I shall wait with great pleasure, according to your instructions, "the result of the explanations which Mr. Adams is instructed to ask," but I suspect that both he and I have already received all necessary explanations on that point. My conversations, at least with Mr. Thouvenel, have covered the whole ground, as stated to you in dispatch No. 35. I add that I communicated immediately to Mr. Adams the substance of that conversation with Mr. Thouvenel.

With much respect, I have the honor to be your obedient servant,
WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Adams.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, August 5, 1861.

SIR: I acknowledge with pleasure the receipt of yours of the 1st instant, inclosing a copy of your note to Lord John Russell, and his reply.

I feel that we have done a good thing in getting the reply of the British government (declaring the amendment to the treaty of Paris inadmissible) in writing. At least, we can proceed now, under our instructions, with a consciousness that we not only have not neglected this point, but that we have the evidence of having pressed it affirmatively. You say you do not comprehend the drift of the last paragraph in Lord John's reply. I think I do, at least in part, and I shall not be surprised if the meaning, which he has *purposely* wrapped up in that general language, should in the end break off all negotiations. He may not refer to this language again, but unless you ask its meaning before the treaty is negotiated, it will be used by them afterwards as an excuse for not carrying it into effect as respects the insurrectionists of the south. The paragraph states, "The engagement of Great Britain will be prospective, and will not invalidate anything already done." The comment after the treaty, predicated upon this language, will be: "We had declared before the treaty that the southern insurrectionists were a belligerent party, and entitled to belligerent rights, (among which is the right to issue letters of marque,) and the treaty was to be prospective only, and not to invalidate anything already done. That, in other words, it does not bind your disloyal citizens, recognized by us as a belligerent party." I long ago wrote Mr. Seward that these powers would, in my judgment, either refuse to negotiate, or, if they did negotiate, it would be with the understanding that it secured us no rights not already conceded, and charged them with no duties not heretofore acknowledged. It is advisable that we raise no question in advance in reference to this matter, but it is necessary that we know what they mean as we go along, for unless I am altogether mistaken there will be trouble enough about the ratification of this treaty upon its merits without its being hampered with any loose points or language left unexplained by us, its negotiators.

With much respect, I am yours, truly,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

His Excellency CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS,
United States Minister.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, September 10, 1861.

SIR: Your dispatch of August 22, No. 35, has been received. I learn from it that Mr. Thouvenel is unwilling to negotiate for an accession by the United States to the declaration of the congress of Paris concerning the rights of neutrals in maritime war, except "on a distinct understanding that it is to have no bearing, directly or indirectly, on the question of the domestic difficulty now existing in our country," and that to render the matter certain Mr. Thouvenel proposes to make a written declaration simultaneously with his execution of the projected convention for that accession.

You have sent me a copy of a note to this effect, addressed to you by Mr. Thouvenel, and have also represented to me an official conversation which he has held with you upon the same subject. The declaration which Mr. Thouvenel proposes to make is in these words:

"DRAFT OF DECLARATION.

"In affixing his signature to the convention concluded on date of this day between France and the United States, the undersigned declares,

in execution of the orders of the Emperor, that the government of his Majesty does not intend to undertake by the said convention any engagements of a nature to implicate it, directly or indirectly, in the internal conflict now existing in the United States."

My dispatch of the 17th day of August last, No. 41, which you must have received some time ago, will already have prepared you to expect my approval of the decision to wait for specific instructions in this new emergency at which you have arrived.

The obscurity of the text of the declaration which Mr. Thouvenel submits to us is sufficiently relieved by his verbal explanations. According to your report of the conversation, before referred to, he said that both France and Great Britain had already announced that they would take no part in our domestic controversy, and they thought that a frank and open declaration in advance of the execution of the projected convention might save difficulty and misconception hereafter. He further said, in the way of specification, that the provisions of the convention standing alone might bind England and France to pursue and punish the privateers of the South as pirates; that they are unwilling to do this, and had so declared. He said, also, that we could deal with these people as we choose, and they (England and France) could only express their regrets on the score of humanity if we should deal with them as pirates, but that they could not participate in such a course. He added, that although both England and France are anxious to have the adhesion of the United States to the declaration of Paris, yet that they would rather dispense with it altogether than be drawn into our domestic controversy. He insisted somewhat pointedly that we could take no just exception to this outside declaration, to be made simultaneously with the execution of the convention, unless we intended that they (England and France) shall be made parties to our controversy, and that the very fact of your hesitation was an additional reason why they should insist upon making such contemporaneous declaration as they proposed.

These remarks of Mr. Thouvenel are certainly distinguished by entire frankness. It shall be my effort to reply to them with moderation and candor.

In 1856 France, Great Britain, Russia, Prussia, Sardinia, and Turkey, being assembled in congress at Paris, with a view to modify the law of nations so as to meliorate the evils of maritime war, adopted and set forth a declaration, which is in the following words:

1st. Privateering is and remains abolished.

2d. The neutral flag covers enemy's goods, with the exception of contraband of war.

3d. Neutral goods, with the exception of contraband of war, are not liable to capture under enemy's flag.

4th. Blockades, in order to be binding, must be effective—that is to say, maintained by forces sufficient really to prevent access to the coast of the enemy.

The states which constituted the congress mutually agreed to submit the declaration to all other nations and invite them to accede to it. It was to be submitted as no special or narrow treaty between particular states for limited periods or special purposes of advantage, or under peculiar circumstances; but, on the contrary, its several articles were, by voluntary acceptance of maritime powers, to constitute a new chapter in the law of nations, and each one of the articles was to be universal and eternal in its application and obligation. France especially invited the United States to accede to these articles. An invitation was equally

tendered to all other civilized nations, and the articles have been already adopted by forty-one of the powers thus invited. The United States hesitated, but only for the purpose of making an effort to induce the other parties to enlarge the beneficent scope of the declaration. Having failed in that effort, they now, after a delay not unusual in such great international discussions, offer their adhesion to that declaration, pure and simple, in the forms, words, and manner in which it was originally adopted and accepted by all of the forty-six nations which have become parties to it. France declines to receive that adhesion unless she be allowed to make a special declaration, which would constitute an additional and qualifying article, limiting the obligations of France to the United States to a narrower range than the obligations which the United States must assume towards France, and towards every other one of the forty-six sovereigns who are parties to it, and narrower than the mutual obligations of all those parties, including France herself.

If we should accede to that condition, it manifestly would not be the declaration of the congress of Paris to which we would be adhering, but a different and special and peculiar treaty between France and the United States only. Even as such a treaty it would be unequal. Assuming that Mr. Thouvenel's reasoning is correct, we should in that case be contracting an obligation, directly or indirectly, to implicate ourselves in any internal conflict that may now be existing or that may hereafter occur in France, while she would be distinctly excused by us from any similar duty towards the United States.

I know that France is a friend, and means to be just and equal towards the United States. I must assume, therefore, that she means not to make an exceptional arrangement with us, but to carry out the same arrangement in her interpretation of the obligations of the declaration of the congress of Paris in regard to other powers. Thus carried out, the declaration of Paris would be expounded so as to exclude all internal conflicts in states from the application of the articles of that celebrated declaration. Most of the wars of modern times—perhaps of all times—have been insurrectionary wars, or “internal conflicts.” If the position now assumed by France should thus be taken by all the other parties to the declaration, then it would follow that the first article of that instrument, instead of being, in fact, an universal and effectual inhibition of the practice of privateering, would abrogate it only in wars between foreign nations, while it would enjoy universal toleration in civil and social wars. With great deference, I cannot but think that, thus modified, the declaration of the congress of Paris would lose much of the reverence which it has hitherto received from Christian nations. If it were proper for me to pursue the argument further, I might add that sedition, insurrection, and treason would find in such a new reading of the declaration of Paris encouragement which would tend to render the most stable and even the most beneficent systems of government insecure. Nor do I know on what grounds it can be contended that practices more destructive to property and life ought to be tolerated in civil or fratricidal wars than are allowed in wars between independent nations.

I cannot, indeed, admit that the engagement which France is required to make without the qualifying declaration in question would, directly or indirectly, implicate her in our internal conflicts. But if such should be its effect, I must, in the first place, disclaim any desire for such an intervention on the part of the United States. The whole of this long correspondence has had for one of its objects the purpose of averting any such intervention. If, however, such an intervention would be the

result of the unqualified execution of the convention by France, then the fault clearly must be inherent in the declaration of the congress of Paris itself, and it is not a result of anything that the United States have done or proposed.

Two motives induced them to tender their adhesion to that declaration—first, a sincere desire to co-operate with other progressive nations in the melioration of the rigors of maritime war; second, a desire to relieve France from any apprehension of danger to the lives or property of her people from violence to occur in the course of the civil conflict in which we are engaged, by giving her, unasked, all the guarantees in that respect which are contained in the declaration of the congress of Paris. The latter of these two motives is now put to rest, inasmuch as France declines the guarantees we offer. Doubtlessly she is satisfied that they are unnecessary. We have always practiced on the principles of the declaration. We did so long before they were adopted by the congress of Paris, so far as the rights of neutral or friendly states are concerned. While our relations with France remain as they now are we shall continue the same practice none the less faithfully than if bound to do so by a solemn convention.

The other and higher motive will remain unsatisfied, and it will lose none of its force. We shall be ready to accede to the declaration of Paris with every power that will agree to adopt its principles for the government of its relations to us, and which shall be content to accept our adhesion on the same basis upon which all the other parties to it have acceded.

We know that France has a high and generous ambition. We shall wait for her to accept hereafter that co-operation on our part in a great reform which she now declines. We shall not doubt that whenever the present embarrassment which causes her to decline this co-operation shall have been removed, as it soon will be, she will then agree with us to go still further, and abolish the confiscation of property of non-belligerent citizens and subjects in maritime war.

You will inform Mr. Thouvenel that the proposed declaration on the part of the Emperor is deemed inadmissible by the President of the United States; and if it shall be still insisted upon, you will then inform him that you are instructed for the present to desist from further negotiation on the subject involved.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 45.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, September 10, 1861.

SIR: * * * *

I herewith inclose to you a copy and translation of a communication recently received by me from Mr. Thouvenel on the subject of the execution of the convention as to maritime rights. It contains nothing that I have not referred to before, but it is evident he wanted to put the

specific grounds of exception to an unconditional exception of the treaty on record.

With much respect, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Thouvenel to Mr. Dayton.

[Translation.]

PARIS, September 9, 1861.

SIR: I have received the letter which you did me the honor to write me, the 26th of the month of August, in order to explain to me the reasons which induced you to await further instructions from your government before proceeding to the signing of the convention relative to maritime rights.

In this state of affairs, I could but await the arrival of the instructions which you have requested, and, consequently, I do not wish to enter into the discussion of the motives which have prevented you from signing the contemplated convention, and which you were pleased to bring to my knowledge. I desire, however, to set forth clearly, by some further explanations, what is the train of thought followed by the government of the Emperor, in judging, like the government of her Britannic Majesty, that it is expedient to accompany the proposed treaty with a special declaration.

If the United States, before the actual crisis, had adhered to the declaration of the congress of Paris, as this adhesion would have bound the whole confederation from that moment, the cabinet of Washington might, at the present time, have availed itself of it to contest the right of the southern States to arm privateers. Now, if this supposition be correct, (*fondée*,) one could not be astonished that the government of Mr. President Lincoln, according to the principles which it has set forth in its manner of viewing the present conflict, should wish to consider the contemplated convention as as much obligatory upon seceded States, in the present circumstances, as if it had preceded the hostilities. But if this opinion be quite explicable on the part of the cabinet of Washington in the situation in which events have placed it, it could not be thus with governments which have proposed to themselves to preserve the strictest neutrality in a struggle, the gravity of which it has no longer been possible for them to disregard. In accepting, then, a proposition presented (*formulée*) by the federal government, when the war had already unhappily broken out between the northern and southern States of the Union, it was natural that the government of the Emperor, having decided not to turn itself aside from the attitude of reserve which it had imposed upon itself, should consider beforehand what extension the cabinet of Washington might be induced, on account of its position, to give to an arrangement by which it declared that the United States renounced privateering. The hostilities in which the federal government is actually engaged offering to it the opportunity of putting immediately into practice the abandonment of this mode of warfare; and its intention, officially announced, being to treat the privateers of the South as pirates, it was manifestly of importance to caution the cabinet of Washington against

the conviction, where it might exist, that the contemplated treaty obliged us thus to consider the privateers of the south as pirates. I will not dwell upon the matter (*n'insisterai pas*) in order to show how much we would deviate from the neutrality we have declared ourselves desirous of observing towards the two factions of the Union, if, after having announced that they would constitute for us two ordinary belligerents, we should contest the primitive rights of a belligerent to one of them, because the other should consent voluntarily to the abandonment of it in a treaty concluded with us. There is no need to point out further how we would forcibly break through our neutrality as soon as we should be constrained, in virtue of the contemplated convention, to treat as pirates the privateers which the South will persist in arming. The cabinet of Washington might then, I repeat, be led, by the particular point of view in which it is placed, to draw from the act which we are ready to conclude such consequences as we should now absolutely reject. It has seemed to us that it is equally important to the two governments to anticipate (*prévenir à l'avance*) all difference of interpretation as regards the application to the actual circumstances of the principles which were to become common to them both. Otherwise, it would have been to be feared, if the same explanations had had to be exchanged later, that there would have been attributed to them a character altogether different from that which they really possess. We would regret, too, sincerely that the least misunderstanding should be produced in our relations with the United States, not to be anxious, from this moment henceforth, to enlighten them upon a reserve, which, being officially stated to the cabinet of Washington before the signing of the convention, maintains strictly one line of neutrality, without taking away from the value of the agreement, which, in this case, we will be happy to establish with the United States.

Accept the assurances of the high consideration with which I have the honor to be, sir, your very humble and very obedient servant,

THOUVENEL.

Mr. DAYTON,
Minister of the United States at Paris.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 3, 1862, p. 27.]

No. 40.

Lord Lyons to Earl Russell.

WASHINGTON, September 10, 1861.

MY LORD: Mr. Seward read to me very rapidly, this morning, the draught of a long dispatch which he has written to Mr. Adams on the subject of the declaration which your lordship proposes to make upon signing the convention by which the United States would adhere to the principles of maritime law laid down by the congress at Paris.

The dispatch would, he said, be communicated to your lordship by Mr. Adams. I was not able to follow Mr. Seward very exactly as he read it, but, so far as I could judge, the language appeared to be suitable and friendly. Mr. Adams is, however, directed to break off the negotiation altogether if your lordship insists upon making the declaration. Hopes are expressed that it may be resumed at a more favorable moment.

A similar dispatch will be addressed to Mr. Dayton, to be communicated to the French government.

In speaking to me, Mr. Seward appeared to consider the negotiation to be completely at an end for the present.

I have, &c.,

LYONS.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 3, 1862, p. 23.]

No. 37.

Earl Cowley to Earl Russell.

PARIS, *September 10, 1861.*

MY LORD: Mr. Dayton has addressed to M. Thouvenel a note couched in much the same terms as that addressed by Mr. Adams to your lordship, declining to proceed with the treaty sanctioning the declaration of Paris without further orders from his government.

M. Thouvenel's reply is to the same purport as your lordship's.

I have, &c.,

COWLEY.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 88.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, September 14, 1861.

SIR: Your dispatch of August 30 (No. 34) has just been received. Your note to Lord John Russell, which accompanies it, is approved. My dispatch to you, (No. 83,) under the date of the 7th instant, will have reached you before this communication can arrive. You will have learned from that paper that your course, as now made known to me, was anticipated by the President, and that he had already directed that the negotiation for our adhesion to the declaration of the congress of Paris should be suspended.

It is due to the British government to say that the letter of Lord John Russell to Mr. Edwards, upon Dominican affairs, to which you refer, and a copy of which you inclose, was read to me by Lord Lyons, pursuant to instructions from Lord Russell.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 3, 1862, p. 23.]

No. 41.

Earl Cowley to Earl Russell.

PARIS, *September 24, 1861.*

MY LORD: M. Thouvenel being without any official intelligence from Washington in consequence of the continued absence of M. Mercier, I have informed his excellency that Mr. Seward had stated to Lord Lyons

that a communication was about to be made to the British and French governments by the United States representatives in London and Paris, that the negotiations for the conclusion of a convention on maritime law will be broken off if the declaration with which it is proposed by the British and French governments to accompany the signatures of it is insisted upon.

M. Thouvenel observed that this only proved how right the two governments had been in making this declaration.

I have, &c.,

LYONS.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 52.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, September 28, 1861.

SIR: I am much gratified to perceive, by the terms of your dispatch No. 83, dated the 7th of this month, a substantial ratification of the position taken by me in regard to Lord Russell's note of the 19th of August, and to the declaration which he proposed to append to the convention concerning neutral rights. I find in it, too, a general coincidence in the argument presented by me in my reply to his lordship on the 23d of August, a copy of which could not have reached the department down to the latest dates yet received. There are some views offered, however, in my note, which are not touched upon in that dispatch. I am, therefore, not as yet fully certain whether, as a whole, it has met with the approbation of the President. For this reason I decided not to hold communication on the subject with Lord Russell, during the time of my late stay under his roof, but rather to wait until after the arrival of the next dispatches from the department, which will probably bring a final review of the negotiation, as it appears, after an examination of all the papers that belong to it. I shall then be in a position to judge of the propriety of any further action which it may be advisable to pursue. His lordship informed me, on my taking leave of him, that he expected to return to London by the 14th of next month, after which I anticipate no delay, like the late one, in the transaction of important business.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

No. 59.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, October 14, 1861.

SIR: After a careful examination of your dispatch (No. 56) in reference to an accession by the United States to the declaration of the congress of Paris, I have thought it best to submit a copy of the same to Mr. Thouvenel, to be read.

As your dispatch recapitulates the points made by Mr. Thouvenel in the conversation with me and reported by me to the government, it was perhaps due to him that he should see if he has been correctly reported. Upon our side, it was equally important that, in a matter of so much interest, the view taken by our government should not be misstated nor

misunderstood. It seems to me now that the case stands, upon the whole correspondence, as well for the government of the United States as could be desired.

With much respect, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 104.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, October 10, 1861.

SIR: Your dispatch of September 28, No. 52; was duly received. I think that previous communications which you will have already had from me will have explained satisfactorily the views of the President in regard to the suspended negotiations concerning maritime law. If, however, they have left any doubt upon your mind of the approval of your proceedings therein, you will accept this general assurance, not only of the President's approval, but also of his conviction that you have performed the duty assigned you with ability and with entire propriety. Events occur rapidly in revolutionary times, and changes in the prospects of this civil war follow each other faster than we can advise you of them. Let it suffice to say that the nation is vigorously organizing a power on land and sea, before which disunion will gradually disappear, and peace and harmony will return. The insurrection would never have obtained its present development but for injudicious toleration of its appeals in Europe. It has given to Europe already only misfortunes. It still works evil there as here, and that it must do continually. How long will it be before European friendly powers shall discover this truth?

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 1, p. 115.]

No. 130.

Lord Lyons to Earl Russell.

[Extracts.]

WASHINGTON, December 6, 1861.

I have the honor to transmit to your lordship a copy of the papers relating to foreign affairs which were laid before Congress with the President's message. As the earliest copies did not come from the press until yesterday afternoon, I have not had time to do more than read somewhat hastily that part of the correspondence which relates to England and France.

A great deal of the space devoted to both countries is occupied by the negotiations concerning the adherence of the United States to the declaration of Paris. Mr. Adams writes frequently and at great

length concerning his misapprehension of your lordship's intentions as to transferring the negotiation to Washington. The simple explanation of this misapprehension is, that Mr. Seward refused to see the dispatch in which your lordship's proposals were made. Your lordship will recollect that Mr. Seward, having been permitted by M. Mercier and me to read and consider in private that dispatch, and a dispatch of a similar tenor from the government of France, refused to receive the formal copies we were instructed to place in his hands, or to take any official notice of their contents. The English dispatch was, however, subsequently communicated officially by your lordship to Mr. Adams, and appears at page 110 of the printed papers inclosed herewith.

From several of the papers now published it appears that it was only an act of common prudence on the part of the governments of Great Britain and France not to accept the accession of this country to the declaration of Paris without stating distinctly what obligations they intended by doing so to assume with regard to the seceded States. Little doubt can remain, after reading the papers, that the accession was offered solely with a view to the effect it would have on the privateering operations of the southern States; and that a refusal on the part of England and France, after having accepted the accession, to treat the southern privateers as pirates, would have been made a serious grievance, if not a ground of quarrel.

The papers on this subject which have struck me as most worthy of notice will be found at pages 76, 77, 79, 186, 187, 194, 198, 202, 207. In the letter from Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton of the 22d June, which appears at page 186, the following passage occurs:

"We shall continue to regard France as respecting our government until she practically acts in violation of her friendly obligations to us, as we understand them. When she does that, it will be time enough to inquire whether, if we accede to the treaty of Paris, she could after that allow pirates upon our commerce shelter in her ports, and what our remedy should then be. We have no fear on this head."

Your lordship will find at page 51 extracts from the menacing dispatch from Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams, which was mentioned in my dispatch to your lordship of the 23d May last. Your lordship is aware that it is supposed that Mr. Seward's dispatch was originally drawn up in still stronger terms.

Copies of Mr. Seward's note to me of the 8th June, 1861, appear to have been sent both to Mr. Adams and Mr. Dayton, in order to dispel any doubt which the British or French governments might entertain that the principle laid down by the third article of the declaration of Paris on maritime law would be observed by the United States in the present civil war. (Pages 63 and 187.)

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 1, p. 114.]

No. 128.

Earl Russell to Lord Lyons.

FOREIGN OFFICE, December 20, 1861.

MY LORD: You may speak to Mr. Seward on the subject of letters of marque.

Should Great Britain and the United States ever unhappily be at war against each other, her Majesty will be ready to relinquish her prerogative, and abolish privateering as between the two nations, provided the President would be ready to make a similar engagement on the part of the United States.

I am, &c.,

RUSSELL.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," 1862, No. 3, p. 28.]

No. 42.

Earl Russell to Lord Lyons.

FOREIGN OFFICE, December 24, 1861.

MY LORD: I omitted at the proper time to mention to you that the refusal of Mr. Adams to sign a convention respecting the declaration of Paris, with my declaration attached to it, was approved by his government.

I felt no doubt it would be so; but the communication of Mr. Adams not being in writing, I omitted to state the fact.

I am, &c.,

RUSSELL.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 132.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, March 20, 1862.

SIR:

I take it for granted that even in the midst of your engrossing occupations you find sufficient time to glance at the report of the debates in Parliament on subjects of interest to the United States, and more especially on international questions of rights on the ocean and of blockade in time of war. The most marked indication to be observed is the general sense of uneasiness at the change operated in the position of Great Britain as a maritime power by the enlargement gradually making of the privileges of neutral nations. While on the opposition side you perceive a distinct disapproval of the agreement made in 1856 at Paris, there is equally perceptible among the ministers a disposition to seize the first opportunity to annul the obligations which it has been thought to impose. The remarks of Sir George Cornwall Lewis upon the effect of war upon the measure, regarded merely as a treaty and not as new rules incorporated into the international law, are full of significance. Lord Palmerston has been not inappropriately reminded of the difference between the tone of his speech at Liverpool in 1856 and of that in the late debate, whilst even Lord Russell is quoted as having expressed the opinion that some modification of the declaration of Paris would seem to be almost indispensable.

Such are the immediate effects of that which, at first blush, appeared to these enlightened gentlemen a great triumph in the case of the Trent. Such are the consequences of refusing to accept the adhesion of the

United States to the declaration of Paris from an over-zealous desire to escape the effect of a precipitate admission of belligerent rights. Both of these events have brought vividly to their observation the consideration of the position of Great Britain in the contingency of a war on the ocean. Like the dog in the fable, in snatching at the shadow, they find they have lost the solid meat. A conflict with the United States would, as things are now, at once transfer the whole carrying trade of Great Britain into the hands of the neutral nations of the continent of Europe. It is now becoming plain that, without the additional provision first suggested by Mr. Marcy, English interests on the sea are in great jeopardy in time of war, and yet that, with the admission of it, the control of the ocean is forever lost. Whichever way they look there is difficulty. Self-interest being the cardinal point of the policy they seek to pursue, it is plain that the adoption of the declaration of Paris is a sacrifice of which they are beginning to repent. Not the least remarkable among the admissions made in this debate is that which specifies the danger of a war with the United States in the event of a persistence in their former doctrine respecting the cargoes of neutral ships, at the time of the contest with Russia, as having been the main cause that prompted the concessions in that declaration. Thus it would seem that the idea of the growing power of the United States as one nation is everywhere present to their imaginations as the great obstacle in the way of their continued domination of the sea. Can it be wondered at if, under these circumstances, the notion of a permanent separation of this power into two parts, one of which can be played off against the other, were not altogether unwelcome to their hearts?

To considerations of a similar kind are we indebted for the security that has been afforded to us in our present contest against interference with the blockade. That there has been and still is a very strong inclination in the country to get rid of it is unquestionable. That but for its unavoidable connection with possibilities of consequences in other and not very remote complications, an attempt of the kind would have been made, I am strongly inclined to believe. The argument that has overborne all these tendencies is drawn from the fear that such a step would only lead in the same direction with the preceding ones taken at Paris. It would ultimately deprive Britannia of her power longer to rule the waves. The "*entente cordiale*" with France is not yet hearty enough to make such a result altogether acceptable even to the fancy. Neither are the relations with Russia so friendly as to render a voluntary release of the main instrument to keep her in check a proposition to be entertained with favor. For these reasons no countenance will be given to any remonstrance against our blockade; neither will the general reasoning of Mr. Cobden, in favor of limiting the right of blockade, find much response among people in authority. Even the admissions rendered necessary to establish a position in reclaiming the rebel emissaries on board the Trent will be limited, as far as may be, to shut the door against further concessions.

It will then continue to depend upon the degree of concert established among those nations of the world which have ever upheld neutral rights, whether any real advance be made in the recognized doctrines of international law or not, just as it has done in preceding times. Great Britain will concede only from a conviction that such a course is the safest for herself. The remedy for other countries is obvious. It is to unite in the labor of raising the obligations of specific contracts to the level of permanent international law, and to enforce the observation of a consistent system of policy upon any single power whenever it may venture to set

up the promptings of its immediate interest as the only rule of action it thinks proper to abide by.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

REVOCATION OF MR. BUNCH'S EXEQUATUR, OR BUNCH MISSION.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 3, 1862, p. 13.]

No. 22.

Lord Lyons to Lord J. Russell.

[Extract.]

WASHINGTON, July 8, 1861.

I have the honor to transmit to your lordship copy of a dispatch by which I have instructed Mr. Bunch, her Majesty's consul at Charleston, to take measures for obtaining a satisfactory declaration from the southern government on the subject of the maritime rights of neutrals.

I drew up these instructions in concert with M. Mercier, and he sent by the same messenger similar instructions to M. Durand de St. André, the French acting consul at Charleston.

[Inclosure.]

Lord Lyons to Consul Bunch.

WASHINGTON, July 5, 1861.

SIR: The course of events having invested the States assuming the title of the Confederate States of America with the character of belligerents, it has become necessary for her Majesty's government to obtain from the existing government in those States securities concerning the proper treatment of neutrals.

I am authorized by Lord John Russell to confide the negotiation on this matter to you; and I have great satisfaction in doing so. In order to make you acquainted with the views of her Majesty's government, I transmit to you a duplicate of a dispatch to me in which they are fully stated.*

It is essential, under present circumstances, that you should act with great caution, in order to avoid raising the question of the recognition of the new confederation by Great Britain. On this account, I think it inadvisable that you should go to Richmond, or place yourself in direct communication with the central authority which is established there.

The most convenient course will, probably, be for you to take advantage of the intercourse which you naturally hold with Mr. Pickens, the governor of the State of South Carolina. I cannot doubt that if you

* For this dispatch see inclosure with dispatch of Lord Russell to Earl Cowley of May 16, 1861, printed under head of "Declaration of Paris, with Mr. Adams's dispatch to Mr. Seward, No. 39, September 7, 1861."

explain, verbally, to Mr. Pickens the views of her Majesty's government, he will have no difficulty in inducing the government at Richmond to recognize, by an official act, the rights secured to neutrals by the second and third articles of the declaration of Paris, and to admit its own responsibility for the acts of privateers sailing under its letters of marque.

The most perfect accord on this question exists between her Majesty's government and the government of the Emperor of the French; and instructions corresponding to these are sent to-day by the Emperor's minister here to the French consul at Charleston. You will accordingly enter into the frankest communication with your French colleague on the subject, and will be careful to act in strict concert with him.

I am, &c.,

LYONS.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 3, 1862, p. 15.]

No. 23.

Lord J. Russell to Lord Lyons.

FOREIGN OFFICE, July 24, 1861.

My LORD: I have received your dispatch of the 8th instant, and I have to state to your lordship that I approve the instructions which you have addressed to Mr. Bunch with a view to obtain a satisfactory declaration from the government of the so-styled Confederate States on the subject of the maritime rights of neutrals.

I am, &c.,

J. RUSSELL.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 3, 1862, p. 17.]

No. 27.

Lord Lyons to Lord J. Russell.

[Extract.]

WASHINGTON, August 2, 1861.

I am informed by a note from Mr. Consul Bunch, dated the 22d ultimo, which reached me yesterday, that he received, on the 19th ultimo, my instructions to endeavor to obtain from the southern government a declaration on the subject of maritime rights. Copies of those instructions were transmitted to your lordship with my dispatch of the 8th ultimo.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," 1862, No. 4, p. 6.]

No. 5.

Consul Bunch to Mr. Hammond.

CHARLESTON, August 5, 1861.

Mr. Bunch presents his compliments to her Majesty's under-secretary of state for foreign affairs, and takes leave to inclose to him herewith certain letters which are intended for the post.

They are principally letters of servants, governesses, &c., (British subjects,) which, owing to the discontinuance of the post, they are unable to send in any other way. Some also contain dividends, the property of British subjects, which they could scarcely receive without Mr. Bunch's intervention.

Mr. Bunch hopes that there is no irregularity in this proceeding. No expense of postage is incurred by the Foreign Office, as the bag in which the letters are contained goes by a private hand to Liverpool.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 4, 1862, p. 1.]

No. 1.

Lord Lyons to Earl Russell.

WASHINGTON, August 16, 1861.

MY LORD: I have the honor to inclose copies of a correspondence which I have had with Mr. Vice-Consul Edwards, who is conducting the affairs of the consulate at New York, Mr. Consul Archibald being at this moment, I am sorry to say, too unwell to attend to business.

The inclosed papers relate to the arrest at New York of Mr. Robert Mure, a gentleman charged by Mr. Consul Bunch with dispatches for your lordship.

Mr. Seward, the Secretary of State, sent for me this morning, and told me that, having received information that Mr. Robert Mure was carrying dispatches from the rebel government to the southern commissioners in Europe, he had given orders that he should be arrested, and that the papers found upon him should be sent to Washington. Among the things which had, in consequence, been sent here, were, Mr. Seward went on to say, a canvas bag addressed to your lordship, and bearing the seal of the consulate at Charleston; a passport from Mr. Consul Bunch, designating Mr. Mure as bearer of dispatches; and an open letter of instructions concerning the dispatches.

Mr. Seward then informed me that he should send by the first opportunity a special messenger to your lordship with the bag, the passport, and the instructions, and that he should direct Mr. Adams to explain to you the circumstances under which the messenger had been arrested and the bag taken from him.

I said to Mr. Seward that, as he had determined to lay the matter himself before your lordship, I would abstain from making any observations upon it.

Mr. Seward seemed to hold, in the first place, that a consul was not entitled to issue passports such as that given to Mr. Mure; and secondly, that the passport was invalid, because the regulation requiring it to be countersigned by the Secretary of State had not been complied with.

I have no doubt that the bag will be delivered to your lordship with the seals unbroken.

Mr. Seward showed me the passport and the instructions given by Mr. Bunch, and he read me a letter from the chief of the police at New York. It appeared that about two hundred private letters addressed to private persons in Europe had been found in Mr. Mure's possession. These had not all been examined. It seemed, however, that nothing objectionable had yet been found, except several copies of a pamphlet containing the southern account of the battle of Bull's Run.

I have directed the vice-consul at New York to watch the proceedings carefully, with a view to ascertain whether there is any foundation for the charge that Mr. Robert Mure was carrying dispatches from the so-called confederate government.

Mr. Robert Mure is, I understand, a brother of Mr. William Mure, her Majesty's consul at New Orleans. He appears to be a Scotchman by birth, but to have become a naturalized American citizen.

I have, &c.,

LYONS.

[Inclosure No. 1.]

Vice-Consul Edwards to Lord Lyons.

NEW YORK, August 14, 1861.

MY LORD: I have the honor to report that Mr. Robert Mure, bearer of a bag of dispatches from Mr. Consul Bunch at Charleston, addressed to her Majesty's secretary of state for foreign affairs, has been arrested this morning by the police, when on the point of sailing for Liverpool in the steamship *Africa*, in accordance with instructions from the Secretary of State at Washington, upon suspicion of carrying dispatches from the *de facto* authorities in the southern States.

Having elicited from Mr. Mure, in a private conversation, that, although a Scotchman by birth, he is a naturalized American citizen, I have thought best not to interfere in the matter, further than to request that the dispatches above referred to should be delivered to me for transmission to their destination. This request has, however, been refused by the police authorities until the receipt of instructions by them from the State Department.

I have, &c.,

PIERREPOINT EDWARDS.

[Inclosure No. 2.]

Lord Lyons to Vice-Consul Edwards.

WASHINGTON, August 15, 1861.

SIR: I have received this morning your dispatch of yesterday, informing me that Mr. Robert Mure; bearer of a bag of dispatches from Mr. Consul Bunch to Lord John Russell, has been arrested at New York.

It appears that Mr. Mure is a naturalized American citizen, and therefore, as at present informed, I approve of your having not interfered in the matter further than by requesting that the dispatches for Lord John Russell should be delivered to you.

I wish, however, to know whether Mr. Mure had a passport from Mr. Bunch, or any other British authority, and if so, whether it was stated on the face of it that he was charged with dispatches.

I beg you to inform me by telegraph of the determination to which the authorities may come with regard to giving up the dispatches.

I am, &c.,

LYONS.

[Inclosure No. 3.]

Lord Lyons to Vice-Consul Edwards.

WASHINGTON, August 16, 1861.

SIR: With reference to my dispatch of yesterday's date, I have to inform you that the Secretary of State of the United States has undertaken to forward to Earl Russell, without delay, the bag of dispatches taken from Mr. Robert Mure.

The Secretary of State has also shown me the passport and instructions with which Mr. Mure was furnished by Mr. Consul Bunch. It will, therefore, be unnecessary for you to make any further inquiries respecting them.

I wish you to watch the proceedings against Mr. Mure very carefully, and to keep me regularly informed concerning them. I particularly desire to ascertain whether any proof is found of the charge on which Mr. Mure has been arrested—that of carrying dispatches from the government of the so-called Confederate States.

I am, &c.,

LYONS.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 3, 1862, p. 22.]

No. 34.

Lord Lyons to Earl Russell.

[Extract.]

WASHINGTON, August 16, 1861.

A paragraph appears this morning in the Baltimore newspaper the Sun, which is generally well informed on southern matters, stating that "the confederate congress has accepted by resolution the second, third, and fourth clauses of the declaration of Paris."

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 63.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, August 17, 1861.

SIR: Alexander Schultz, a special messenger, will deliver to you this dispatch, together with a bag containing papers addressed to Lord John Russell.

On the 13th instant I was advised by a telegram from Cincinnati that Robert Mure, of Charleston, was on his way to New York to embark at that port for England, and that he was a bearer of dispatches from the usurping insurrectionary authorities of Richmond to Earl Russell. Other information bore that he was a bearer of dispatches from the same authorities to their agents in London. Information from various sources agreed in the fact that he was traveling under a passport from the British consul at Charleston.

Upon this information I directed the police at New York to detain Mr. Mure, and any papers which might be found in his possession, until I

should give further directions. He was so detained, and he is now in custody at Fort Lafayette, awaiting full disclosures. In his possession were found seventy letters, four of which were unsealed and sixty-six sealed. There was also found in his possession a sealed bag marked "Foreign Office, 3," with two labels, as follows: "On Her Brit. Maj. service. The Right Honorable the Lord John Russell, M. P., &c., &c., &c. Dispatches in charge of Robert Mure, Esq.," signed Robert Bunch. "On Her Brit. Maj. service. The Right Honorable the Lord John Russell, M. P., H. B. M.'s Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Foreign Office, London, R. Bunch." The bag bears two impressions of the seal of office of the British consul at Charleston, and seems to contain voluminous papers.

There were also found upon Mr. Mure's person, in an open envelope, what pretends to be a passport, in the following words. (See Annex A.)

Also a letter of introduction, which is as follows. (See Annex B.)

There were also found several unsealed copies of a printed pamphlet, entitled "A narrative of the Battles of Bull Run and Manassas Junction, July 18th and 21st. Accounts of the advance of both armies, the battles and rout of the enemy, compiled chiefly from the detailed reports of the Virginia and South Carolina press. Charleston, Steam Power Presses of Evans & Cogswell, No. 3 Broad, and 103 East Bay streets, 1861."

This pamphlet is manifestly an argument for the disunion of the United States. Several copies of it were found addressed to persons in England.

The marks and outward appearance of the bag indicate that its contents are exclusively legitimate communications from the British consul at Charleston to H. B. M.'s government. Nevertheless, I have what seem to be good reasons for supposing that they may be treasonable papers, designed and gotten up to aid parties engaged in arms for the overthrow of this government and the dissolution of the Union. These reasons are: 1st. That I can hardly conceive that there can be any occasion for such very voluminous communications of a legitimate nature being made by the consul at Charleston to his government at the present time. This circumstance, however, is admitted to be very inconclusive. 2d. Consuls have no authority to issue passports, the granting of them being, as I understand, not a consular but a diplomatic function. Passports, however, have, in other times, been habitually granted by foreign consuls residing in the United States. But soon after the insurrection broke out in the southern States a regulation was made by this department, which I have excellent means of knowing was communicated to the British consul at Charleston, to the effect that, until further orders, no diplomatic or consular passports would be recognized by this government, so far as to permit the bearer to pass through the lines of the national forces or out of the country unless it should be countersigned by the Secretary of State and the commanding general of the army of the United States. Mr. Mure had passed the lines of the army, and was in the act of leaving the United States in open violation of this regulation. Moreover, the bearer of the papers, Robert Mure, is a naturalized citizen of the United States, has resided here thirty years, and is a colonel in the insurgent military forces of South Carolina. 3d. If the papers contained in the bag are not illegal in their nature or purpose, it is not seen why their safe transmission was not secured, as it might have been, by exposing them in some way to Lord Lyons, British minister residing at this capital, whose voucher for their propriety, as Mr. Bunch must well know, would exempt them from all scrutiny or sus-

picion. 4th. The consul's letter to the bearer of dispatches attaches an unusual importance to the papers in question, while it expresses great impatience for their immediate conveyance to their destination, and an undue anxiety lest they might, by some accident, come under the notice of this government. 5th. The bearer is proved to be disloyal to the United States by the pamphlet and the letters found in his possession.

I have examined many of the papers found upon the person of Mr. Mure, and I find them full of treasonable information, and clearly written for treasonable purposes. These, I think, will be deemed sufficient grounds for desiring the scrutiny of the papers and surveillance of the bearer on my part.

Comity towards the British government, together with a perfect confidence in its justice and honor, as well as its friendship towards the United States, to say nothing of a sense of propriety, which I could not dismiss, have prevented me from entertaining for a moment the idea of breaking the seals, which I have so much reason to believe were put upon the consular bag to save it from my inspection, while the bearer himself might remove them on his arrival in London, after which he might convey the papers, if treasonable, to the agents of the insurgents, now understood to be residing in several of the capitals in Europe.

I will not say that I have established the fact that the papers in question are treasonable in their nature, and are made with purposes hostile and dangerous to this country. But I confess I fear they are so, and I apprehend either that they are guilty dispatches to the agents of disunion, or else that, if they are really addressed to the British government, they are papers prepared by traitors in the insurrectionary States, with a view to apply to the British government for some advantage and assistance or countenance from that government injurious to the United States and subversive of their sovereignty. Of course, I need hardly say that I disclaim any thought that Earl Russell has any knowledge of the papers or of their being sent, or that I have any belief or fear that the British government would, in any way, receive the papers if they are illegal in their character, or dangerous or injurious to the United States. It is important, however, to this government that whatever mischief, if any, may be lurking in the transaction, be counteracted and prevented.

I have, therefore, upon due consideration of the case, concluded to send the bag by a special messenger, who will deliver it into your care, and to instruct you to see that it is delivered accordingly to its address in exactly the condition in which you receive it.

You will also make known to the Earl Russell the causes and the circumstances of the arrest and detention of Mr. Mure and his papers, adding the assurance that this government deeply regrets that it has become necessary; and that it will be very desirous to excuse the brief interruption of the correspondence of the British consul, if it is indeed innocent, and will endeavor, in that case, to render any further satisfaction which may be justly required. On the other hand, you will, in such terms as you shall find most suitable and proper, intimate that if the papers in question shall prove to be treasonable against the United States, I expect they will be delivered up to you for the use of this government, and that her British Majesty's consul at Charleston will, in that case, be promptly made to feel the severe displeasure of the government which employs him, since there can be no greater crime against society than a perversion by the agent of one government of the hospitality afforded to him by another, to designs against its safety, dignity, and honor.

I think it proper to say that I have apprised Lord Lyons of this transaction, and of the general character of this letter, while he is not in any way compromised by any assent given to my proceedings, or by any opinion expressed by him or asked from him.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES F. ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

A.

No. 121.

Passport.

HER BRITANNIC MAJESTY'S CONSULATE,
North and South Carolina.

We, Robert Bunch, esq., her Britannic Majesty's consul for the States of North and South Carolina, &c., do hereby certify that the bearer, Mr. Robert Mure, is a British merchant residing in Charleston, and that he proceeds hence to New York and Liverpool, charged with dispatches on her Majesty's service from us to the Lord John Russell, her Majesty's principal secretary of state for foreign affairs. We therefore request that he may be permitted to pass freely, and that he may receive all proper protection and assistance in virtue of his employment by us.

Given under our hand and seal of office at the city of Charleston the 7th day of August, 1861.

ROBERT BUNCH,
Her Majesty's Consul.

B.

Consul Bunch to Mr. Mure.

CHARLESTON, August 7, 1861.

SIR: You will receive herewith a bag of dispatches addressed to Lord John Russell, her Majesty's principal secretary of state for foreign affairs, which I beg you to convey, with all convenient speed, to Liverpool. Should you, upon reaching that port, not proceed immediately to London, you will be so good as to deliver the bag to her Majesty's postmaster at Liverpool, with the request that he will forward it at once to the Foreign Office.

I beg to impress upon you that these dispatches are of the greatest importance, and I would suggest that you should keep them by you as much as possible, not allowing them to get into your luggage.

In the improbable event of your being detained on your road to New York by any authority of the United States, I have no objection to the bag being delivered to an officer of rank, upon his giving a receipt for it, and promising to have it delivered to her Majesty's minister at Washington. But I can scarcely suppose the possibility of your detention.

Should you unfortunately be detained in New York by illness or otherwise, the bag may be delivered to her Majesty's consul, with the request that he will forward it. But I prefer that it should go with you.

Wishing you a safe and pleasant journey, I am, &c.,

ROBERT BUNCH.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 64.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, August 17, 1861.

SIR: Among the letters found on the person of Robert Mure, mentioned in my dispatch No. 63, of this date, there are many which more or less directly implicate Mr. Robert Bunch, the British consul at Charleston, as a conspirator against the government of the United States. The following is an extract from one of them:

"Mr. B., on oath of secrecy, communicated to me also that the *first step* to recognition was taken. He and Mr. Belligny together sent Mr. Trescott to Richmond yesterday, to ask Jeff. Davis, president, to ——— the treaty of ——— to ——— the neutral flag covering neutral goods to be respected. This is the first step of direct treating with our government, so prepare for active business by January 1."

You will submit this information to the British government, and request that Mr. Bunch may be removed from his office, saying that this government will grant an exequatur to any person who may be appointed to fill it, who will not pervert his functions to hostilities against the United States.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES F. ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c. &c.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 4, 1862, p. 2.]

No. 2.

Lord Lyons to Earl Russell.

[Extract.]

WASHINGTON, *August 19, 1861.*

Mr. Seward sends the bag taken from Mr. Mure to Mr. Adams, and directs him to cause it to be delivered to your lordship. I am confident that it contains nothing to which reasonable objection could be made by the United States government. Mr. Bunch has, indeed, very probably transmitted in it to your lordship papers which might, *per se*, be treasonable in Mr. Seward's eyes. Such, for instance, might be proclamations of the president of the so-called Confederate States, proceedings of the legislature at Richmond, and similar documents which it would be Mr. Bunch's duty to transmit to his government for their own information. The present condition of the southern States renders it, of course, absolutely necessary, for the protection of her Majesty's subjects, that her Majesty's consuls should be in communication with the *de facto* authorities. The bag, therefore, may very well contain reports from Mr. Bunch of communications with those authorities, on the maritime rights of neutrals, the securing her Majesty's subjects from compulsory enlistment, and similar matters. But I feel quite sure that Mr. Bunch would not make a bag addressed to your lordship a vehicle for forwarding the correspondence of the southern government, or any papers of an improper character.

The reasons assigned by Mr. Seward, in his dispatch to Mr. Adams,

for suspecting that Mr. Bunch's bag contains treasonable papers, do not appear to me to be by any means conclusive.

That Mr. Bunch should, in the present state of the country, provide a person to whom he intrusted dispatches with a passport, was a matter of common prudence. It was, of course, impossible for him at Charleston to have the passport countersigned by the Secretary of the United States. I do not, indeed, suppose Mr. Seward to hold, as a general rule, that any passport is necessary to enable a person to travel in this country, or to quit it. I conceive that he maintains only that a passport does not afford any special protection to the bearer of it, unless it be countersigned by the United States authorities.

It is not extraordinary that Mr. Bunch should not have sent the bag in the first instance to this legation. The gentleman charged with it could not have come to Washington without deviating from his route to New York, and incurring delay.

So far as I recollect from once reading them, I do not think that the unsealed instructions given by Mr. Bunch to Mr. Mure express undue anxiety lest the bag might come under the notice of this government. Indeed, if I remember right, Mr. Mure was authorized by them, if he should be himself detained, to give up the bag to any commissioned officer of the United States to be forwarded to this legation.

On the questions of principle involved in this matter, I am not called upon to express an opinion. It is right, however, that I should say that, although I conceive Mr. Seward's suspicions to be entirely unfounded, I have not the least doubt that they are sincerely entertained by him. I think, too, that having been led to take the strong measure of arresting the messenger and seizing the dispatches, he has been very anxious to manifest in the subsequent proceedings respect and courtesy towards her Majesty's government.

P. S.—I am informed that Mr. Robert Mure is a cousin, and not, as I incorrectly stated in my dispatch of the 16th instant, a brother of Mr. William Mure, her Majesty's consul at New Orleans.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 4, 1862, p. 7.]

No. 7.

Lord Lyons to Earl Russell.

[Extract.]

WASHINGTON, August 23, 1861.

With reference to my dispatch of the 16th instant, I have the honor to inclose an extract from the New York Tribune of the day before yesterday, which purports to publish a part of the correspondence seized upon Mr. Robert Mure.

I inclose also an article from the New York Herald of yesterday, commenting upon a passage relating a conversation with "Mr. B.," by which designation the writer is supposed to indicate Mr. Consul Bunch. The "Mr. Buligny" mentioned is no doubt M. Boulogny, the French consul. The assertions attributed to "Mr. B." are such as to show that if the writer really had a conversation with Mr. Consul Bunch, he must either have misunderstood what was said, or intentionally misstated it.

However this may be, it is clear that Mr. Robert Mure, in taking

charge of the letters which have been seized, abused Mr. Bunch's confidence, for Mr. Bunch had positive instructions from me not to forward himself any letters alluding to military or political events; excepting letters to or from British officials. He had equally positive instructions from me that care should be taken that no person bearing a passport from a British consulate, stating him to be charged with dispatches, should convey any letters not intrusted to him by the consul himself.

[Inclosure No. 1.—Extract from the New York Tribune of August 21, 1861.]

THE ARREST OF MR. MUIR.

When Muir of South Carolina was diverted from the gang-plank of the Persia to the inn kept by stout Martin Burke for the political refreshment of rebels, known as Fort Lafayette, his baggage, of course, was taken out of the ship, and went into the curious keeping of government officials. A detective, to whom we are indebted for many favors, has furnished us with copies of some of the correspondence found in Muir's trunk.

* * * * *

Another mercantile letter from Charleston, written by copying press so illegibly that only a portion of it could be deciphered, and the signature to which is but an inky "quirl," speaks just enough of British recognition of rebels to stimulate curiosity and make us wish that the writer had been more communicative. Mr. Trescott's companion to Richmond seems to have been a Mr. Bulligny; but he may have been anybody whose name begins with "B" and ends with "y," "g," or "j." An interesting quality in this epistle is that it enables us to know the spirit of Mr. Russell's letter to the London Times, descriptive of the Bull Run battle, and teaches us that this gentleman has the amiable habit of treating his rebel friends to private copies of the fun he makes of the running Yankees. But to the scrawl:

"Mr. B. showed me confidentially Mr. Russell's letter about the battle; his letter beats all I have yet seen in print about the Yankees' running. He says we could have had Washington by merely asking.

"He says Lord Lyons had an inclination to ask Mr. Seward 'if the Confederate States of America had not the belligerent rights, according to his notion, he would certainly admit they had the belligerent power.' On oath of secrecy he communicated to me also that the first step of recognition was taken. He and Mr. Bulligny together sent Mr. Trescott to Richmond yesterday to ask Jeff. Davis, president, to accept the treaty of commerce, to accept the neutral flag carrying neutral goods. This is the first step of direct treating with our government."

[Inclosure No. 2.—Extract from the New York Herald of August 22, 1861.]

ENGLISH NEUTRALITY—STARTLING DEVELOPMENTS.

Among the papers said to be found on the rebel emissary Mure, who was arrested just as he was taking his departure for England in the Persia, is the following:

"Mr. B. showed me confidentially Mr. Russell's letter about the bat-

tle. His letter beats all I have yet seen in print about the Yankees running. He says we could have had Washington by merely asking.

"He said Lord Lyons had an inclination to ask Mr. Seward, 'If the Confederate States of America had not the belligerent rights, according to his notion, he would certainly admit they had the belligerent power.' On oath of secrecy he communicated to me also that the first step of recognition was taken. He and Mr. Boulogny together sent Mr. Trescott to Richmond yesterday to ask Jeff. Davis, president, to accept the treaty of commerce, to accept the neutral flag carrying neutral goods. This is the first step of direct treating with our government.

"If prepared for active business by 1st of January, you may rely on all going right.

"Crops good and fine. There is more corn made than ever known. Cotton will be 4,000,000 bales, with what was left from last crop.

"Have no doubt that there will be soon direct opportunities with the south by steam. All our privateers do remarkably well, though some less good than others."

The animus that dictated Russell's letter describing the Bull Run fight is clearly accounted for by the above. His early letters from New York and the south led to the suspicion that he was sent out on a special mission to write up and aid secession. We have now positive evidence of the fact. But of this more by and by.

What we have immediately to deal with is the statement that envoys were sent to Richmond on the part of, or with the connivance of, Lord Lyons, to ask the rebel government whether they would accept the provisions of the treaty of Paris and enter into a treaty of commerce with England. We may observe, parenthetically, that the confederate congress have since accepted two of the clauses of the former treaty, and rejected that about privateering. It will be said, perhaps, that we are assuming too much in connecting the English minister with these proceedings. The comment made by the writer of the letter from which the statement is taken seems to leave no doubt upon the point. "This," he says, "is the first step of direct treating with our government." There could be no direct treating except with the English minister or his authorized agents.

Has the attention of the State Department been directed to this extraordinary document? If, as published, it has really been found among Mure's papers, not a moment should be lost in calling on Lord Lyons for an explanation.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 3, 1862, p. 23.]

No. 38.

Lord Lyons to Earl Russell.

[Extract.]

WASHINGTON, August 30, 1861.

I have received, just in time to have the inclosed copy made for your lordship, a dispatch from Mr. Consul Bunch, reporting the proceedings taken by him, in conjunction with his French colleague, M. de Belligny, to obtain the adherence of the so-called Confederate States to the last three articles of the declaration of Paris.

The authentic copy of the resolution of the congress at Richmond sent by Mr. Bunch, and inclosed herein, differs very much from the copy which appeared in the newspapers, and which was transmitted to your lordship with my dispatch of the 23d instant.

Mr. Bunch's dispatch has just been delivered to me by M. de Belligny himself. I have not time to have any communication with M. de Belligny before the departure of the messenger; but the impression I have derived from a very hasty perusal of Mr. Bunch's dispatch is that the negotiation has been extremely well managed by the two consuls.

[Inclosure No 1.]

Consul Bunch to Lord Lyons.

[Extract.]

CHARLESTON, August 16, 1861.

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt, on the 19th ultimo, of your lordship's dispatch of the 5th July, together with its inclosure; viz., a dispatch from Lord John Russell of the 17th May last, on the subject of the proposed adhesion of the Confederate States of America to the four articles of the declaration of Paris, and of the rights of neutrals in the contest now raging in this country. I proceed to reply to your lordship's communication.

In so doing, I begin by requesting your lordship to convey to Lord John Russell the expression of my sincere gratitude for the honor which he has been pleased to confer upon me by selecting me as the organ of her Majesty's government in the negotiation to which your lordship's dispatch and its inclosure have reference. I beg leave also to offer to your lordship my grateful acknowledgments of the kind manner in which you have placed the matter in my hands.

Immediately upon receipt of your lordship's dispatch, I proceeded to put myself into communication with my French colleague, M. de Belligny, who, as I found, had received instructions from M. Mercier of a character precisely similar to those with which I was honored. After the fullest and frankest interchange of our respective views, we determined upon the line of action which I am now about to report to your lordship.

Our attention was first directed to the suggestion contained in your lordship's dispatch, that, as it would be inexpedient for us to go to Richmond, our negotiation might, probably, be advantageously conducted through Mr. Pickens, the governor of South Carolina, with whom you naturally supposed that we were in frequent communication. But, notwithstanding our earnest desire to meet in every way the wishes of our chiefs, we were forced to the conclusion that it would be inexpedient to approach him, for several reasons, among which it may suffice to mention his absence from Charleston. He has been for some weeks past on his plantation in the interior of the State.

But we were so far fortunate as to secure the valuable services of an agent in the person of Mr. —, who is well known to your lordship, and whose position seemed admirably to adapt him for the duties which he was so obliging as to undertake.

Mr. — left for Richmond on the 20th July. Arriving on the 22d, he found that the president was with the army, whither Mr. — followed him; but meeting him half-way between Richmond and Manassas, returned with him to the capital on the 23d. On the next day Mr. —

had an interview with his excellency, and communicated to him the mission with which he was charged. Mr. Davis expressed no unwillingness to entertain the matter, although he signified his regret that it should not have been more formally brought before him, as it seemed to him that if the declaration which it was sought to obtain from the government of the Confederate States was of sufficient importance to require the overture now made to him, it was of equal consequence that it should be made in a more regular manner.

His excellency, as we understand, at once summoned a meeting of the cabinet, and the matter was placed in the hands of the secretary of state, Mr. Hunter, who has been appointed in the place of Mr. Toombs. It was soon determined that congress should be invited to issue a series of resolutions, by which the second, third, and fourth articles of the declaration of the treaty of Paris should be accepted by the Confederate States. These resolutions were passed on the 13th instant, approved on the same day by the president, and I have the honor to inclose herewith to your lordship the copy of them which has been sent to Mr. — by the secretary of state, to be delivered to M. de Belligny and myself.

Your lordship will observe that, by these resolutions, the Confederate States accept the second, third, and fourth articles of the declaration of Paris, but by their resolution declare, with reference to the first article, that they "maintain the right of privateering as it has been long established by the practice and recognized by the law of nations." With respect to this resolution, I beg to remark that the wishes of her Majesty's government would seem to have been fully met, for as no proposal was made that the confederate government should abolish privateering, it could not be expected that they would do so of their own accord, particularly as it is the arm upon which they most rely for the injury of the extended commerce of their enemy. But the secretary of state has placed in the hands of Mr. —, for communication to us, the inclosed copy of the instructions issued for the guidance of privateers, and appeals to them, as well as to the character of the government, for a proof of their determination that the privateers shall conform themselves to the ordinary practices sanctioned by the law of nations. We think that we may rely on the assurances thus given, supported, as they are, by the language of the resolution.

The fact is that the President and the government are a good deal annoyed at the refusal of France, England, and other nations to allow prizes to be condemned in their ports, which they consider as somewhat of a departure from a strict neutrality, and which they still hope may be reconsidered as the contest advances. They also confidently expect that the same anxiety for the mitigation of the evil consequences of the present war, which has rendered the accession of the Confederate States to the declaration of Paris a matter of interest to France and England, will induce other nations to insist upon the rigorous fulfillment by the United States of the principle contained in the fourth article, viz., the effectiveness of the blockade instituted by that power.

The negotiation having thus been brought to a close, the President expressed to Mr. — his hope that the existence of those extended relations of commercial intercourse which had rendered the application now made to him by the governments of France and England a necessity in the view of those nations, would materially contribute to hasten a formal recognition of the new confederacy, which was disposed, on its part, to show its full appreciation of a cordial and friendly understanding between itself and the other nations of the earth, with which it was prepared to enter into association on terms of equality.

It only remains for me to express my hope that the manner in which this negotiation has been conducted may meet with the approval of your lordship and of her Majesty's government. In common with my French colleague, I am fully sensible of the obligations under which we are to Mr. —, who has carried out what we conceived to be the views of our respective governments.

[Inclosure No. 2.]

Resolution touching certain points of maritime law, and defining the position of the Confederate States in respect thereto.

Whereas the plenipotentiaries of Great Britain, Austria, France, Prussia, Russia, Sardinia, and Turkey, in a conference held at Paris on the 16th of April, 1856, made certain declarations concerning maritime law, to serve as uniform rules for their guidance in all cases arising out of the principles thus proclaimed;

And whereas it being desirable not only to attain certainty and uniformity, as far as may be practicable, in maritime law, but also to maintain whatever is just and proper in the established usages of nations, the Confederate States of America deem it important to declare the principles by which they will be governed in their intercourse with the rest of mankind: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the congress of the Confederate States of America:

1st. That we maintain the right of privateering, as it has been long established by the practice and recognized by the law of nations.

2d. That the neutral flag covers enemy's goods, with the exception of contraband of war.

3d. That neutral goods, with the exception of contraband of war, are not liable to capture under enemy's flag.

4th. That blockades, in order to be binding, must be effectual; that is to say, maintained by a force sufficient really to prevent access to the coast of the enemy.

Signed by the president of congress on the 13th August, and approved same day by the president of the Confederate States of America.

[Inclosure No. 3.]

Instructions issued by the president of the Confederate States to private armed vessels.

1. The tenor of your commission, under the act of congress entitled "An act recognizing the existence of war between the United States and the Confederate States and concerning letters of marque, prizes, and prize goods," a copy of which is herein annexed, will be kept constantly in your view. The high seas referred to in your commission you will understand generally to refer to the low-water mark; but with the exception of the space within one league, or three miles from the shore of countries at peace with the United States and the Confederate States. You will, nevertheless, execute your commission within the distance of the shore of the nation at war within the United States, and even on the waters within the jurisdiction of such nation, if permitted to do so:

2. You are to pay the strictest regard to the rights of neutral powers, and the usages of civilized nations, and in all your proceedings

towards neutral vessels you are to give them as little molestation or interruption as will consist with the right of ascertaining their neutral character, and of detaining and bringing them in for regular adjudication in the proper cases.

You are particularly to avoid even the appearance of using force or seduction, with the view to deprive such vessels of their crews or the passengers, other than persons in the military service of the enemy.

3. Towards enemy's vessels and their crews you are to proceed in exercising the rights of war, with all the justice and humanity which characterizes this government and its citizens.

4. The master and one or more of the principal persons belonging to the captured vessels are to be sent, as soon after the capture as may be, to the judge or judges of the proper court in the Confederate States, to be examined on oath touching the interest or property of the captured vessel and her lading; and at the same time are to be delivered to the judge or judges all papers, charter-parties, bills of lading, letters and other documents and writings found on board; and the said papers to be proved by the affidavit of the commander of the captured vessel, or some other person present at the capture, to be produced as they were received, without fraud, addition, subtraction, or embezzlement.

5. Property, even of the enemy, is exempt from seizure on neutral vessels, unless it be contraband of war.

If goods contraband of war are found on any neutral vessel, and the commander thereof shall offer to deliver them up, the offer shall be accepted, and the vessel left at liberty to pursue its voyage, unless the quantity of contraband goods shall be greater than can be conveniently received on board your vessel, in which case the neutral vessel may be carried into port for the delivery of the contraband goods.

The following articles are declared by this government contraband of war, as well as all others that are so declared by the laws of nations, viz:

All arms and implements serving for the purpose of war by land or sea, such as cannons, mortars, guns, muskets, rifles, pistols, petards, bombs, grenades, balls, shot, shell, pikes, swords, bayonets, javelins, lances, horse furniture, holsters, belts, and generally all other implements of war.

Also, timber for building, pitch, tar, resin, copper in sheets, sails, hemp, cordage, and generally whatever may serve directly to the equipment of vessels, wrought iron and planks only excepted.

Neutral vessels conveying enemy's dispatches, or military persons in the service of the enemy, forfeit their neutral character, and are liable to capture and condemnation. But this rule does not apply to neutral vessels bearing dispatches from the public ministers or ambassadors of the enemy residing in neutral countries.

By the command of the president of the Confederate States.

ROBERT TOOMBS,
Secretary of State.

Form of bond.

Know all men by these presents: That we ,* are bound
to the Confederate States of America in the full sum of † thousand

* This blank must be filled with the name of the commander for the time being, and the owners, and at least two responsible sureties not interested in the vessel.

† This blank must be filled with a "five" if the vessel be provided with only 150 men, or a less number; if with more than that number, the blank must be filled with a "ten."

dollars, to the payment whereof, well and truly to be made, we bind ourselves, our heirs, executors and administrators, jointly and severally, by these presents.

The condition of this obligation is such, that whereas application has been made to the said Confederate States of America for the grant of a commission or letter of marque and general reprisals, authorizing the * or vessel called the _____, to act as a private armed vessel in the service of the Confederate States on the high seas, against the United States of America, its ships and vessels, and those of its citizens, during the pendency of the war now existing between the said Confederate States and the said United States.

Now, if the owners, officers, and crews, who shall be employed on board of said vessel when commissioned, shall observe the laws of the Confederate States and the instructions which shall be given them according to law for the regulation of their conduct, and shall satisfy all damages and injuries which shall be done or committed contrary to the tenor thereof by such vessel during her commission, and shall deliver up said commission when revoked by the President of the Confederate States, then this obligation shall be void, but otherwise shall remain in full force and effect.

Signed, sealed, and delivered in presence of _____, on the _____ day of _____.

A. B.,

C. D.,

Witnesses.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 3, 1862, p. 27.]

No. 39.

Lord Lyons to Earl Russell.

[Extract.]

WASHINGTON, September 2, 1861.

Since I sent off my dispatch to your lordship of the 30th ultimo, I have read with attention Mr. Consul Bunch's dispatch to me of the 16th instant, giving an account of the steps taken by him and his French colleague, M. de Belligny, to obtain the adherence of the so-called Confederate States to the principles of maritime law established by the declaration of Paris. I have also had an opportunity of conversing with M. de Belligny on the subject.

I am confirmed in the opinion that the negotiation, which was difficult and delicate, was managed with great tact and good judgment by the two consuls.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 4, 1862, p. 6.]

No. 6.

Earl Russell to Earl Cowley.

FOREIGN OFFICE, September 7, 1861.

MY LORD: I transmit with this dispatch copies of two letters from Mr. Adams.†

* This blank must be filled with the character of the vessel, "ship," "brig," "schooner," "steamer," &c.

† Mr. Adams's dispatches of September 3, 1861, to Lord Russell, with Mr. Adams's dispatch to Mr. Seward, No. 41, September 9, 1861, *post*.

Your excellency will see that Mr. Adams, in one of these letters, requests that Mr. Bunch may be removed from his consulship at Charleston. The ground for this request is, that Mr. Bunch, together with the French consul, executed an instruction given to him by her Majesty's government in concert with the government of France. Indeed, the first proposal for such an instruction seems to have been made by M. Thouvenel to your excellency, and is contained in a dispatch of your excellency of May 9. [For the note here referred to see the the next communication.]

Her Majesty's government feel it impossible, in these circumstances, to yield to the request of Mr. Adams, and they intend in their answer to assume the entire responsibility of the act denounced by Mr. Adams, without, however, admitting that it is a step to the recognition of the so-called Confederate States.

Your excellency will communicate the substance of this dispatch to M. Thouvenel.

I am, &c.,

RUSSELL.

The following is the note referred to in the preceding communication:

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 3, 1862, p. 3.]

Earl Cowley to Lord J. Russell.

PARIS, May 9, 1861.

MY LORD: I called this afternoon on M. Thouvenel for the purpose of obtaining his answer to the proposals contained in your lordship's dispatch of the 6th instant, relative to the measures which should be pursued by the maritime powers of Europe for the protection of neutral property in presence of the events which are passing in the American States.

M. Thouvenel said the imperial government concurred entirely in the views of her Majesty's government, and would be prepared to join her Majesty's government in endeavoring to obtain of the belligerents a formal recognition of the 2d and 3d articles of the Declaration of Paris. M. de Flahault would receive instructions to make this known officially to your lordship.

With regard to the manner in which this endeavor should be made M. Thouvenel said that he thought a communication should be addressed to both parties in as nearly as possible the same language, the consuls being made the organs of communication with the southern States; that the language employed should be that of good-will and friendship; that the present state of things should be deplored, and a declaration made that the governments of Great Britain and France intended to abstain from all interference, but that the commercial interests of the two countries demanded that they should be assured that the principles with respect to neutral property laid down by the Congress of Paris would be adhered to—an assurance which the two governments did not doubt they should obtain, as the principles in question were in strict accordance with those that had been always advocated by the United States.

M. Thouvenel observed that as France and the United States had been always agreed on these maritime questions it would be difficult for either party in America to refuse their assent to the principles now invoked.

His excellency said further, that in looking for precedents it had been discovered that Great Britain, although treating at the commencement of the American war letters of mark as piracy, had, after a time, recognized the belligerent rights of the States in rebellion against her.

I have, &c.,

COWLEY.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 41.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, September 9, 1861.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the reception at the hands of your messenger, Captain Schultz, of a bag purporting to contain public dispatches from Mr. Robert Bunch, the consul at Charleston, to Lord Russell, the head of the foreign office in London. In conformity with the instructions contained in your No. 63, dated the 17th of August, I immediately addressed a note to Lord Russell, explanatory of the reasons why such a bag was received through this channel, a copy of which is herewith transmitted. In it you will perceive that I have endeavored to adhere as closely as possible to the language of your communication to me. At the same time, in obedience to the directions contained in your No. 64, dated the 17th of August, I addressed another note to his lordship, stating the grounds of dissatisfaction felt by the President with the conduct of Mr. Bunch, and requesting his removal. A copy of this note is likewise appended to the present dispatch. These two notes, together with the bag in exactly the same condition in which I received it from Captain Schultz, I directed my assistant secretary, Mr. Benjamin Moran, to take with him to the foreign office, and there to deliver into the hands of his lordship if present, or, if absent from town, into those of one of her Majesty's under secretaries of state for foreign affairs. Accordingly, on the afternoon of Tuesday, the 4th instant, at about quarter past three o'clock, as Mr. Moran reports to me, he went to the foreign office, and finding Lord Russell to be absent from town, he delivered the bag and the notes into the hands of Mr. Layard, one of the under secretaries. Since that time I have had no reply from his lordship, although I received on Saturday last two notes from him on matters of minor consequence. I had hoped to send something by Captain Schultz, who returns in the *Great Eastern*, and I shall yet do so if it should come before the bag closes. I have consented to the departure of Captain Schultz, mainly because Mr. Dayton has expressed a great desire that he should take charge of his dispatches as soon as possible.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

HON. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, September 3, 1861.

MY LORD: I have the honor to inform your lordship that I have received by the hands of a special messenger of the government, just

arrived in the steamer *Europa* from the United States, a sealed bag marked Foreign Office, 3, with two labels, as follows:

"On her Britannic Majesty's service. The right honorable the Lord John Russell, M. P., &c., &c., &c. Dispatches in charge of Robert Mure, esq.

"ROBERT BUNCH."

"On her Britannic Majesty's service. The right honorable the Lord John Russell, M. P., her Britannic Majesty's principal secretary of state for foreign affairs, foreign office, London.

"R. BUNCH."

Agreeably to instructions communicated by my government to me, to see that this bag is delivered accordingly to its address in exactly the condition in which I received it, I have the honor to transmit the same by the hands of my assistant secretary, Mr. Benjamin Moran, who is directed to deliver it in your own hands, if present, or, if absent, into those of one of the under-secretaries of state for foreign affairs.

It now becomes my duty to explain the circumstances under which this bag has found its way from the possession of the person to whom it was originally intrusted into that of the authorities of the United States.

It appears that the Secretary of State of the United States, on the 15th of August last, received information deemed worthy of confidence, that Mr. Robert Mure, the bearer of this bag, was at the same time acting as a bearer of dispatches from the insurrectionary authorities of Richmond to your lordship. Other information came that he was a bearer of dispatches from the same authorities to their agents in London. And still other information from various sources agreed in affirming that he was traveling under a passport issued by her Majesty's consul at Charleston. Upon this information, instructions were sent forthwith to the police of New York to detain Mr. Mure, and any papers which might be found in his possession. He was accordingly detained, and is now in custody at Fort Lafayette, awaiting full disclosures. A large number of papers were found upon him, an examination of which was found fully to sustain some portions of the information which had been furnished, and to prove that Mr. Mure was acting as the bearer of a treasonable correspondence between persons acting in open arms against the government of the United States and their friends and emissaries in Great Britain. He had also with him several copies of a printed pamphlet purporting to be a narrative of the events of the 21st of July at Manassas Junction, addressed to persons in England, and evidently intended to further the purposes of the conspirators in South Carolina.

Robert Mure, the bearer of these papers, is represented to be a naturalized citizen of the United States, where he has resided for thirty years, and as actually holding a commission of colonel in the insurgent forces of South Carolina.

It turned out to be true that in the hands of this gentleman were found, in an open envelope, a paper purporting to be a passport, a copy of which I have the honor to append to this note as paper marked A; and a letter of instructions, signed by Robert Bunch, her Majesty's consul for the United States, residing at Charleston, a copy of which is likewise appended, as paper marked B.

In the absence of all other evidence against Mr. Bunch to prove his departure from the line of his legitimate duty, it is quite enough to call the attention of your lordship to the fact that in issuing such a paper as this passport he has acted in direct contravention of a regulation issued

by the proper department of the United States of which he had received notice, which forbids all recognition of any diplomatic or consular passport, so far as to permit the bearer to pass through the lines of the national forces or out of the country, unless it should be countersigned by the Secretary of State and the commanding general of the army of the United States. Mr. Mure attempted to do both with a paper bearing no such signatures.

There is, however, other and still more serious cause of complaint against Mr. Bunch, as disclosed by the papers of Mr. Mure, the exposition of which I am compelled to reserve for a separate communication. The present purpose is confined to an explanation of the reasons which have actuated the government of the United States in taking the extraordinary step which has had for one of its consequences the effect of diverting, be it but for a moment, a part of the official correspondence of her Majesty's government from the channel in which it was originally placed. I am directed to express the regret the government feels that such a measure had become imperative, and to assure your lordship of its earnest desire to make any suitable amends which may justly be required. If, in the process, there may have happened a slight interruption of the correspondence of the British consul, it is their desire that the pressing nature of the emergency may induce your lordship to excuse it.

It is needless to say that the bag passes into the hands of your lordship in precisely the same condition in which it came from those of Mr. Mure. Comity towards the government of a friendly nation, together with a full confidence in its justice and honor, to say nothing of a sense of propriety, would deter the government, which I have the honor to represent, from entertaining the idea of breaking the seals which protect it, even were there ten times more reason than there is to presume an intention under so sacred a sanction to perpetrate a wrong certainly on one and perhaps on both governments. Still less is it the intention of the American government to intimate the smallest suspicion of any privy whatever on the part of the authorities in Great Britain in aiding, assisting, or countenancing a supposed design injurious to the United States and subversive of their sovereignty. Much ground as there is for presuming that it never was the intention of those who prepared the package to forward it to its nominal address, but that it was rather the design, after bringing bad matter under this sacred sanction safely through the dangers of hostile scrutiny, to open the bag themselves and to disseminate the contents far and wide among the evil-disposed emissaries to be found scattered all over Europe; this consideration has never weighed a single moment to change their views of this trust when put in the balance with the strong reliance placed upon the good faith of her Majesty's constitutional advisers. Least of all has it been in the thought of any one that your lordship would consent in any way to receive the papers, if they are really illegal in their character or dangerous or injurious to the United States.

Should it, however, prove on inspection that any abuse has been attempted in America of the confidence to which her Majesty's government is in every way entitled, I am directed to express to your lordship the hope that any papers of a treasonable character against the United States may be delivered up to me for the use of my government, and that her Majesty's consul at Charleston, if shown to be privy to the transmission of them under such a form, may be made promptly to feel the severe displeasure of the government whose good faith he has sought to dishonor. For there can be no difference of opinion as to the nature

of an offense which involves the perversion by the agent of one government of the hospitality afforded to him by another to conspire against its safety, dignity, and honor.

I pray your lordship to accept the assurances of the highest consideration with which I have the honor to be your lordship's most obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCOIS ADAMS.

The Right Honorable EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

[For inclosures A and B see dispatch of Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams No. 63, August 17, 1861, *anti*.]

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, September 3, 1861.

The undersigned, envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States, deeply regrets the painful necessity that compels him to make a representation to the right honorable Lord Russell, her Majesty's principal secretary of state for foreign affairs, touching the conduct of Mr. Robert Bunch, her Majesty's consul for the port of Charleston, in the United States. It appears from the contents of one of the many letters found in the possession of Mr. Robert Mure, bearer of dispatches from Mr. Bunch to the government of Great Britain, but detained as an agent of the enemies of the United States, that the following statement is made of the action of Mr. Bunch in Charleston:

"Mr. B., on oath of secrecy, communicated to me also that the *first step* to recognition was taken. He and Mr. Belligny together sent Mr. Trescott to Richmond yesterday to ask Jeff. Davis, president, to ——— the treaty of ——— to ——— the neutral flag covering neutral goods to be respected. This is the first step of direct treating with our government. So prepare for active business by 1st January."

The undersigned is instructed to submit this information to her Majesty's government, with a request that, if it be found to be correct, Mr. Bunch may be at once removed from his office. The undersigned is further instructed to add that the President will cheerfully accord an exequatur to any person who may be appointed to succeed him, who will faithfully perform his functions without injury to the rights and the interests of the United States.

The undersigned avails himself of this occasion to renew to Lord Russell the assurances of his highest consideration.

CHARLES FRANCOIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 4, 1862, p. 12.]

No. 10.

Earl Cowley to Earl Russell.

[Extract.]

PARIS, *September 10, 1861.*

In pursuance of your lordship's instructions, I communicated this afternoon to M. Thouvenel your dispatch of the 7th instant, relating to the

request of the United States government for the removal of Mr. Consul Bunch from Charleston, in consequence of his having executed an instruction given to him by her Majesty's government in concert with the government of France, together with such other documents as were necessary to enable his excellency to comprehend the affair, and I asked him whether any similar request had been made of the French government by Mr. Dayton.

His excellency replied in the negative. I then said that I presumed that in the event of any such request being put forward, the French government would follow the course pursued by her Majesty's government, and indicated in your lordship's above-mentioned dispatch. M. Thouvenel replied that undoubtedly he could not give up an agent who had done no more than execute the orders intrusted to him.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 4, 1862, p. 12.]

No. 11.

Earl Russell to Lord Lyons.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *September 14, 1861.*

MY LORD: I transmit to you herewith copies of two notes received from Mr. Adams, together with copies of my replies.*

Since the date of Mr. Adams's note I have received from your lordship your dispatch of the 23d ultimo, with an extract from the New York Herald of August 22, containing, no doubt from official sources, a more complete copy of the letter in question than which is contained in the note of Mr. Adams.

The letter in the New York Herald begins with a notice by the writer of Mr. Russell's letter in the Times, which he says was shown to him "confidentially." He then proceeds to give an account of a supposed question of your lordship, upon which your lordship states that, to the best of your belief, you have had no communication with Mr. Bunch. He then proceeds to say, "On oath of secrecy he communicated to me also that the first step of recognition was taken. He and M. Bouligny together sent Mr. Trescott to Richmond yesterday to ask Jeff. Davis, president, to accept the treaty of commerce, to accept the neutral flag carrying neutral goods. This is the first step of direct treating with our government."

It is quite clear, however, that the communication in question was not a first step to recognition; neither was there any proposal regarding a treaty of commerce.

Your lordship, in your dispatch, says: "The assertions attributed to Mr. B. are such as to show that if the writer really had a conversation with Mr. Consul Bunch, he must either have misunderstood what was said, or intentionally misstated it.

"However this may be, it is clear that Mr. Robert Mure, in taking charge of the letters which have been seized, abused Mr. Bunch's confidence; for Mr. Bunch had positive instructions from me not to forward

* Notes of Mr. Adams to Lord Russell of September 3, 1861, are printed with dispatch of Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward, No. 41, September 9, 1861, *ante*, and notes of Lord Russell to Mr. Adams of September 9, 1861, are printed with dispatch of Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward, No. 44, of September 14, 1861, *post*.

himself any letters alluding to military or political events, excepting letters to or from British officials. He had equally positive instructions from me that care should be taken that no person bearing a passport from a British consulate stating him to be charged with dispatches, should convey any letters not intrusted to him by the consul himself."

These circumstances make it necessary to inquire into the conduct of Mr. Bunch. But until your lordship has received from Mr. Bunch an explanation of his conduct, no step can be taken.

I have therefore only to instruct your lordship to inform Mr. Bunch, as soon as you conveniently can, that the statements made in regard to his proceedings require explanation.

I am, &c.,

RUSSELL.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 44.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, September 14, 1861.

SIR: I now have the honor to transmit copies of two notes received yesterday from Lord Russell, in answer to my notes of the 3d of September, transmitting to him the bag of Mr. Bunch. It appears from one of them that Mr. Bunch has been acting under secret instructions, which are only now acknowledged because they have come to light, and that his granting a safe conduct to an emissary of secession, charged with treasonable papers, is no objection to his neutral character in the eyes of his employers. With regard to the question presented in the other note, it is satisfactory to me, at least in so far as it devolves all responsibility for the further treatment of the question into more capable hands. I transmit also a copy of my reply.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *September 9, 1861.*

SIR: I received with some surprise from Lord Lyons an intimation that a sealed bag, directed by one of her Majesty's consuls to her Majesty's secretary of state, had been seized and detained by order of the Secretary of State of the United States.

It seems to have been suspected that her Majesty's consul had inserted in his official bag, and covered with his official seal, the correspondence of the enemies of the government of the United States now engaged in open hostilities against them.

Had her Majesty's consul so acted he would have, no doubt, been guilty of a grave breach of his duty both towards his own government and that of the United States; but I am happy to say there does not appear, on opening the bag at the Foreign Office, to be any ground for such a suspicion.

Her Majesty's government were advised that the suspension of the conveyance by post of letters from British subjects between the northern and the southern States was a contravention of the treaty on this subject contracted by the two governments. Her Majesty's government have been unwilling to press this view on the United States; but this stoppage of the post has occasioned great inconvenience to individuals, and I inclose a copy of a note from Mr. Bunch to the under-secretary of foreign affairs showing the mode in which he has endeavored to palliate the evil by inclosing private letters in his consular bag.

I shall address any further communication I may have to make on this subject to Lord Lyons.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

CHARLESTON, August 5, 1861.

Mr. Bunch presents his compliments to her Majesty's under-secretary of state for foreign affairs, and takes leave to inclose to him herewith certain letters which are intended for the post.

They are principally letters of servants, governesses, &c., (British subjects,) which, owing to the discontinuance of the post, they are unable to send in any other way. Some also contain dividends, the property of British subjects, which they could scarcely receive without Mr. Bunch's intervention.

Mr. Bunch hopes that there is no irregularity in this proceeding. No expense of postage is incurred by the Foreign Office, as the bag in which the letters are contained goes by a private hand to Liverpool.

Her Majesty's UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE

For Foreign Affairs.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, September, 9, 1861.

The undersigned, her Majesty's principal secretary of state for foreign affairs, has received a communication from Mr. Adams, envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States at this court, dated the 3d instant, giving some information regarding the conduct of Mr. Bunch, her Majesty's consul at Charleston, in the United States, and requesting, on the part of the government of the United States, that Mr. Bunch may at once be removed from his office.

The undersigned will, without hesitation, state to Mr. Adams that, in pursuance of an agreement between the British and French governments, Mr. Bunch was instructed to communicate to the persons exercising authority in the so-called Confederate States the desire of those governments that the second, third, and fourth articles of the declaration of Paris should be observed by those States in the prosecution of the hostilities in which they were engaged. Mr. Adams will observe that the commerce of Great Britain and France is deeply interested in the maintenance of the articles providing that the flag covers the goods,

and that the goods of a neutral taken on board a belligerent ship are not liable to condemnation.

Mr. Bunch, therefore, in what he has done in this matter, has acted in obedience to the instructions of his government, who accepts the responsibility of his proceedings so far as they are known to the foreign department, and who cannot remove him from his office for having obeyed his instructions.

But when it is stated in a letter from some person not named, that the first step to the recognition of the southern States by Great Britain has been taken, the undersigned begs to decline all responsibility for such statement.

Her Majesty's government have already recognized the belligerent character of the southern States, and they will continue to consider them as belligerents. But her Majesty's government have not recognized, and are not prepared to recognize, the so-called Confederate States as a separate and independent state.

The undersigned requests Mr. Adams to accept the assurance of his highest consideration.

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, September 13, 1861.

The undersigned, envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States, has the honor to acknowledge the reception this day of two notes from the right honorable Earl Russell, her Majesty's principal secretary of state for foreign affairs, both dated the 9th of September, and both in reply to notes addressed to his lordship by the undersigned on the 3d instant, touching the case of Mr. Bunch, her Majesty's consul at Charleston, and the mode of transmission of his dispatches. The undersigned has the honor to inform his lordship that copies of these notes will be transmitted by the next steamer for the consideration of the government of the United States.

The undersigned requests Earl Russell to accept the assurance of his highest consideration.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. Earl RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 4, 1862, p. 13.]

No. 13.

Earl Cowley to Earl Russell.

[Extract.]

PARIS, *September 17, 1861.*

No observations whatever have been as yet made by Mr. Dayton to M. Thouvenel respecting the part taken by the French consul at Charleston to obtain the assent of the so-called Confederate States to the last three articles of the declaration of Paris.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 4, 1862, p. 13.]

No. 14.

Lord Lyons to Earl Russell.

WASHINGTON, September 27, 1861.

MY LORD: By your lordship's dispatch of the 14th instant, I am directed to inform Mr. Consul Bunch, as soon as I conveniently can, that the statements concerning the proceedings made in the letters taken from Mr. Robert Mure require explanation.

I received by private hand, on the 22d instant, a short note from Mr. Bunch, dated the 31st August, to the following effect:

"Pray do not believe a word of the intercepted letter respecting my communication to the supposed writer. It is false, and the work of a spy. The letter itself is absolute nonsense, as you must have seen. I am anxious to hear from you."

The letter to which Mr. Bunch refers is probably that which appears in the extract from the New York Tribune of the 21st of August, which was inclosed in my dispatch to your lordship on the 23d of that month.

On the 19th instant I forwarded dispatches, written on that day, to Charleston, by her Majesty's ship *Steady*. Among them was one to Mr. Bunch, in which I made to him the same observations concerning his proceedings as those which your lordship has done me the honor to quote from my dispatch to you of the 23d of August, already referred to.

I have consequently no doubt that Mr. Bunch will send ample explanations of his conduct by the first opportunity. I requested the commander of the *Steady* to return to New York, if Mr. Bunch had dispatches of importance to send, but otherwise to proceed to the south in execution of the orders of Rear-Admiral Sir Alexander Milne. Should the *Steady* not return to New York, I shall avail myself of the authority given me by the admiral, and request that her Majesty's ship *Rinaldo* may go to Charleston for Mr. Bunch's dispatches.

I have, &c.,

LYONS.

[From the British Blue Book, "North America," No. 4, 1862, p. 14.]

No. 15.

Lord Lyons to Earl Russell.

[Extract.]

WASHINGTON, October 8, 1861.

I have the honor to inclose a copy of a dispatch which I received last night from Mr. Consul Bunch, explanatory of his conduct with regard to the transmission of dispatches by Mr. Robert Mure. * * *

[Inclosure.]

Consul Bunch to Lord Lyons.

CHARLESTON, September 30, 1861.

MY LORD: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your lordship's dispatch of August 20, respecting the case of Mr. Robert Mure, and to reply to it as fully as possible.

It appears to me that the best way of so doing will be to take the various suspicions which have arisen in the matter, one by one.

First. I totally disbelieve the accusations against Mr. Mure, that he was the bearer of dispatches from the *de facto* government of Richmond to any one at all. He most positively and distinctly denied to me on two occasions, that he had anything whatever except letters from his mercantile friends, whom he could not refuse. It must be borne in mind that when Mr. Mure left Charleston, the Adams Express Company was carrying correspondence openly, and with the consent of the United States government; and, also, that in carrying the letters he did, Mr. Mure violated no postal law whatever. By the law of the United States an unpaid carrier may take any number of letters out of the country without any postage being prepaid, or paid at all, as far as the United States is concerned. Mr. Mure was surely not answerable for the contents of the letters he carried, and I could not consider him as being disqualified from being the bearer of a bag to Earl Russell, by his doing what every one who left Charleston was doing daily, and the express company openly.

So much for Mr. Mure; now for myself.

It is, I hope, needless for me to assure your lordship that there was not one single paper in my bag which was not entirely and altogether on her Majesty's service. Even some private letters which I was sending for English governesses, nursery maids, and individuals of humble position (all of which came to me open,) were put under cover to the under-secretary of foreign affairs, with a letter explaining what they were, and why I sent them, so that there was not a line which was not directed officially to Lord John Russell or the under-secretary. The bag was bulky, it is true; and why? It contained, besides dispatches, four copies of four different kinds of official pamphlets issued at Richmond, and forwarded in pursuance of your lordship's orders.

The "passport" was not intended as such. It was not one of my regular printed passports, but a certificate stating that Mr. Mure was charged by me with dispatches. I was wrong, perhaps, in calling him a British merchant, without adding that he was a naturalized citizen of the United States, but I thought that the absence of the words "British subject" would lead to that conclusion; besides which, I had on several occasions sent dispatches by *bond fide* native-born American citizens, without objection.

As your lordship knows, it was simply impossible to procure the counter-signature of the Secretary of State to the so-called passport.

Your lordship is also aware that my dispatches to the Foreign Office always go direct, and not through the legation.

As to my having tried to avoid the possibility of my dispatches falling into the hands of the United States authorities, the very reverse is the fact, as in my letter of instructions to Mr. Mure, I distinctly told him to deliver them to any United States officer of rank, if objection were made to his carrying them.

My messenger was a naturalized American citizen, because I could get no one else of such undoubted position and respectability. But he was a Scotchman born, and a British subject in loyalty and feeling, although he had done what numbers do to enable them to hold property in this country. I disapprove totally of the step myself, but I know that it is taken by hundreds who would deeply resent the accusation that they had thereby intended to show disrespect to the Queen. As to Mr. Mure having been a colonel in the forces of South Carolina, it is not the case.

He was, some years ago, captain of a militia company in Charleston, but he has taken no part whatever in the late troubles.

I feel deeply indebted to your lordship for the opinions you have been pleased to express to Earl Russell respecting my conduct in this matter. The contents of my bag will have spoken for themselves before now; I am quite content to be judged by them. It is, at any rate, a satisfaction to me to feel that your lordship was convinced, without any explanation from me, that I would not prostitute my official position by forwarding an improper or clandestine correspondence.

I have, &c.,

R. BUNCH.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 108.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, October 22, 1861.

SIR: The receipt of your dispatch of the 14th of September (No. 44) has been already acknowledged.

It was accompanied by Earl Russell's reply to the note which, in execution of my instructions, you addressed to him on the subject of the detention of a bearer of dispatches sent by Robert Bunch, her Majesty's consul at Charleston, and the substitution by me of another person to convey his consular bag to Great Britain.

Earl Russell says, in his note, that if it had been true (as we apprehended) that Mr. Bunch had inserted into his official bag and covered with his official seal the correspondence of the enemies of this government in the United States, he would have been guilty of a grave breach of his duty towards his own government and that of the United States. Earl Russell says, also, that on the opening of the bag at the Foreign Office (in London) no ground for that suspicion was revealed.

These declarations, made with unquestioned candor and freedom, are entirely satisfactory upon the main point involved in your note. It is therefore a pleasant duty for me to instruct you to reply to Earl Russell that this government regrets the interruption of the passage of the consular dispatches, which has occurred in consequence of a mistaken suspicion that the agent who transmitted them was abusing the confidence of the two governments. I sincerely hope that no serious inconvenience resulted from the delay.

Earl Russell, after making the explanations which I have quoted proceeds to remark that her Majesty's government was advised that the suspension of the conveyance by post of letters from British subjects between the northern States and the southern States was in contravention of the treaty on this subject contracted between the two governments; that her Majesty's government had been, nevertheless, unwilling to press this view on the United States; but that this stoppage of the post has occasioned great inconvenience to individuals. His lordship then submits a copy of a note which Mr. Bunch had written to the under-secretary of state, showing the mode in which he had endeavored to palliate the evil by inclosing private letters in his official bag. His lordship then dismisses the subject, saying that he shall address any further communication he may have to make thereon, to Lord Lyons.

Mr. Bunch, in his note, states that he incloses in the bag, to the under-secretary's address, certain letters which are intended for the post, and that they are principally letters of servants, governesses, &c., British subjects, which, owing to the discontinuance of the post, they

are unable to send in any other way; also, that some of the letters contain dividends, the property of British subjects, which they could scarcely receive without Mr. Bunch's intervention. He adds that he hopes that there is no irregularity in this proceeding, since no expense of postage is incurred, because the bag in which the letters are contained goes by a private hand to Liverpool. I read this note under the light thrown upon it by the explanations of Earl Russell, which show that the whole correspondence contained in the bag was innocent.

In these circumstances, what remains open to special exception in Mr. Bunch's proceeding is, his substitution of his consular bag and official seal for the mail-bag and mail-locks of the United States, and of his own mail-carrier for the mail-carrier of the United States.

The proceeding of the consul in these respects, certainly, is not defensible on any ground of treaty or international law; nor does Earl Russell in any way imply that he deems it so. The proceeding, however, was practically harmless, and it is not likely to be repeated.

I confess to the fact of the interruption of the post, and also that it works literally a non-fulfillment of a treaty stipulation. I deplore it for that reason, as well as for the public and private injuries that it occasions, not only abroad but at home. But the British government is well aware that the interruption has occurred, not through the deliberate or even voluntary consent of the government, but through the sudden violence of an insurrection which has not only obstructed the mails, but which even seeks to overthrow not only the treaty in question, but even the government of the United States, and the Union itself, which constitutes them one treaty-making and treaty-observing nation. Suppression of the correspondence between parties in that nation with each other, in this country and in foreign countries, is a measure which is essential to the suppression of the insurrection itself, and to a complete restoration of the functions of the government throughout the Union. I feel sure that the magnanimity of the British government may be relied upon not to complain, at one and the same time, of the breach of our international postal treaty under such circumstances, and of our resort to a measure which is indispensable to complete our ability to fulfill it.

I have deferred this dispatch so long, supposing that it is possible Lord Lyons might be charged to say something to me bearing on the subject.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 109.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, October 23, 1861.

SIR: I recur once more to your dispatch of September 14, No. 44. On the 3d of that month you addressed a note to Earl Russell, in which you informed him, by my direction, that from the contents of the many letters found in the possession of Mr. Robert Mure, bearer of dispatches to the government of Great Britain, but detained at New York as an agent of the enemies of the United States, the following statement is made of the action of Mr. Bunch in Charleston: "Mr. Bunch, on oath of secrecy, communicated to me also that the first step to recognition was taken;

that he and Mr. Belligny together sent Mr. Trescot to Richmond yesterday to ask Jeff. Davis, president, to ——— the treaty of ——— to ——— the neutral flag covering neutral goods to be respected. This is the first step of direct treating with our government. So prepare for active business by first of January."

You submitted this information to her Majesty's government with a request on the part of the President of the United States that, if it should be found to be correct, Mr. Bunch might be at once removed from his office. And you further added, by my direction, that the President would cheerfully accord an exequatur to any person who might be appointed to succeed Mr. Bunch, who would faithfully perform his functions without injury to the rights and interests of the United States.

There is appended to your dispatch, now before me, the written answer of the Earl Russell to your note thus recited.

His lordship answers that he will, without hesitation, state to Mr. Adams that, in pursuance of an agreement between the British and French governments, Mr. Bunch was instructed to communicate to the persons exercising authority in the so-called Confederate States the desire of those governments that the second, third and fourth articles of the declaration of Paris should be observed by those States in the prosecution of the hostilities in which they were engaged. His lordship then asked you to observe that the commerce of Great Britain and France is deeply interested in the maintenance of the articles providing that the flag covers the goods, and that the goods of a neutral taken on board a belligerent ship are not liable to confiscation. Earl Russell thereupon proceeds to say that Mr. Bunch, in what he has done in this matter, has acted in obedience to the instructions of his government, who accept the responsibility of his proceedings, so far as they are known to the foreign department, and who cannot therefore remove him from his office for having obeyed their instructions. But his lordship adds that, when it is stated in a letter from some person, not named, that the first step to the recognition of the southern States by Great Britain has been taken, he, Earl Russell, begs to decline all responsibility for such statement; and he remarks on this branch of the subject that her Majesty's government have already recognized the belligerent character of the southern States, and they will continue to consider them as belligerents, but that her Majesty's government have not recognized, and are not prepared to recognize, the so-called Confederate States as a separate and independent state.

You are instructed to reply to this note of her Majesty's principal secretary of state for foreign affairs:

First. That her Majesty's government, having avowed that Mr. Bunch acted under their instructions, so far as his conduct is known to the foreign department, and that government having avowed their responsibility for his proceedings in that extent, it is admitted that, so far as that portion of the subject is concerned, the matter is to be settled directly with her Majesty's government.

Secondly. That a law of the United States forbids any person, not specially appointed, or duly authorized, or recognized by the President, whether citizen or denizen, privileged or unprivileged, from counseling, advising, aiding or assisting in any political correspondence with the government of any foreign state whatever, with an intent to influence the measures of any foreign government, or of any officer or agent thereof, in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of the government. The proceeding of Mr. Bunch was clearly and distinctly in violation of this positive law.

Thirdly. This government finds no sufficient justification or excuse for the proceeding of Mr. Bunch, thus shown to be in violation of the law of the United States, in the consideration that Great Britain was deeply interested in the maintenance of the articles which provide that the flag covers the goods, and that the goods of a neutral, taken on board a belligerent ship, are not liable to confiscation.

It is enough to say on this subject that, in our view, the proper agents of the British government, to make known that interest here, are the diplomatic, not the consular agents of her Majesty; and that the only authority in this country, to which any diplomatic communication whatever can be made, is the government of the United States itself.

Still less can the United States admit that communication by Mr. Bunch, while exercising consular privileges with which he was clothed by the consent of the United States, with insurgents in arms against the federal government, is justified by the declaration of the British ministry that they have already recognized the belligerent character of the insurgents, and that they will continue to consider them as belligerents. It is understood to be true that her Majesty's government have heretofore issued a royal proclamation which they interpret as declaring that they recognize the insurgents as a belligerent. But it is also true that this government has, with equal decision and with equal resolution, announced to the British government that any such declaration made by the British government would not be accepted as modifying, in the least degree, the rights or powers of this government, or the obligations due to them by Great Britain as a friendly nation. Still adhering to this position, the government of the United States will continue to pursue, as it has heretofore done, the counsels of prudence, and will not suffer itself to be disturbed by excitement. It must revoke the exequatur of the consul, who has not only been the bearer of communications between the insurgents and a foreign government, in violation of our laws, but has abused equally the confidence of the two governments by reporting, without the authority of his government, and in violation of their own policy, as well as of our national rights, that the proceeding in which he was engaged was in the nature of a treaty with the insurgents, and the first step towards a recognition by Great Britain of their sovereignty. Moreover, the conduct of the person in question, even while this correspondence has been going on, as well as before it commenced, has been that not of a friend to this government, or even of a neutral, but of a partisan of faction and disunion.

In reviewing this subject, it would be unjust to her Majesty's minister residing here, as well as to her Majesty's government, to omit to say that that minister has, in all his proceedings, carefully respected the sovereignty and the rights of the United States, and that the arrangements which have been made by him, with the approval of this government, for communication between the British government and its consuls, through the national vessels of Great Britain entering blockaded ports, without carrying passengers or private letters, seems to forbid any necessity for a recurrence of such proceedings as those which have brought about these explanations. You will inform the Earl Russell that the exequatur of Mr. Bunch has been withdrawn because his services as consul are not agreeable to this government, and that the consular privileges thus taken from him will be cheerfully allowed to any successor whom her Majesty's government may appoint, against whom no grave personal objections shall exist. It is a source of satisfaction to the President to reflect that the proceeding which I have been considering occurred some time ago, and that the part of it which was most calculated to offend, and to

which exception is now especially taken, finds no support in the communication of Earl Russell.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 4, 1862, p. 15.]

No. 16.

Earl Russell to Lord Lyons.

FOREIGN OFFICE, October 26, 1861.

MY LORD: I have received your dispatch of the 8th instant, inclosing a copy of a dispatch from Mr. Bunch dated the 30th ultimo, explaining his proceedings in regard to the transmission of dispatches and letters by Mr. Robert Mure, and I regret to have to state to your lordship that her Majesty's government hold that explanation to be unsatisfactory.

It is to be observed, in the first place, that Mr. Bunch violated your lordship's instruction to the consuls not to intrust dispatches to persons charged with the transmission of private correspondence.

But, in the next place, Mr. Bunch gives no distinct denial to the statement contained in a private letter published in the newspapers that he had confided to the writer the purport of the order he had received from her Majesty's government, and had represented it as a first step to the recognition of the so-called Confederate States.

Your lordship is directed to require further explanation on these points from Mr. Bunch, and to send a ship of war to Charleston to communicate with Mr. Bunch and bring his reply.

I am, &c.,

RUSSELL.

[From the British Blue Book, "North America," No. 4, 1862, p. 15.]

No. 17.

Lord Lyons to Earl Russell.

[Extract.]

WASHINGTON, October 28, 1861.

I have already had the honor to inform your lordship, by telegraph, that Mr. Seward read to me the day before yesterday a dispatch which he had prepared, directing Mr. Adams to announce to your lordship that this government had determined to revoke the exequatur of Mr. Consul Bunch.

The dispatch appeared, when Mr. Seward read it to me, to be signed, and to be ready to be sent off. But Mr. Seward said that he was not in any hurry about it, and that he should, perhaps, not send it by the first packet. It may, therefore, not reach Mr. Adams until some days after the dispatch which I am now writing is in your lordship's hands.

Mr. Seward read it to me after a conversation which I had with him the day before yesterday at the State Department on other matters. It

began by recapitulating, at some length, the communications between your lordship and Mr. Adams. It quoted the declaration in your lordship's note of the 9th September, that her Majesty's government recognized the southern States as belligerents. With reference to that declaration it stated that the government of the United States were aware that a royal proclamation had been issued which her Majesty's government construed as a recognition of the belligerent rights of the rebels. But it asserted that the government of the United States did not admit that anything had occurred which changed in the smallest degree the relations of the southern States with foreign powers. The southern and the northern States formed one confederation; communications concerning the one, no less than those concerning the other, must be addressed to the federal government at Washington, and must be made by diplomatic, not by consular officers. To this position the government of the United States would firmly adhere.

With regard to your lordship's announcement that her Majesty's government accepted the responsibility of Mr. Bunch's proceedings, so far as they were known to them, the dispatch stated, if I recollect right, that it was admitted that this announcement put an end, so far as Mr. Bunch was concerned, to all question respecting the proceedings to which it applied.

I did not find it easy to follow the line of argument next taken. The object seemed to be to assign reasons for withdrawing the exequatur, founded on parts of Mr. Bunch's conduct, distinct from the proceedings for which her Majesty's government had declared themselves responsible. For this purpose it seemed to be assumed that the assertions in an intercepted letter from a person not known, which are quoted in Mr. Adams's note to your lordship of the 5th ultimo, were literally true. On this authority it appeared to be taken for granted that Mr. Bunch had said that the first step to recognition had been taken. It was argued that, as your lordship had declined all responsibility for such a statement, Mr. Bunch must be held personally responsible for it.

An additional charge was, moreover, brought by the dispatch against Mr. Bunch of having violated a law which was cited, and which forbids residents in the United States to engage with a foreign government in any communication calculated to thwart the policy of the federal government.

Farther on, Mr. Bunch was accused of having been, from the beginning, a partisan of the rebels, and of having shown, by various improper acts, hostility to the United States.

Lastly, I think the ground was taken that Mr. Bunch's exequatur was to be withdrawn, because he was not acceptable to the United States, or because it was not agreeable to them that he should continue to discharge consular functions in this country.

An opportunity was taken in the course of the dispatch to express satisfaction with the arrangements which I had made for communicating with her Majesty's consulates in the southern States by means of ships of war.

Not the smallest allusion, that I recollect, was made anywhere to the share taken by the late French consul at Charleston, M. de Belligny, in the communications with the so-called confederate government.

It may seem superfluous to make any observations on the charges brought against Mr. Bunch. I cannot, however, help saying that never were serious charges brought upon a slighter foundation. The communications with the southern government were conducted by Mr. Bunch with very remarkable prudence and discretion. The accusation that he

stated that the first step had been taken towards recognition I believe to be false. It rests, at all events, upon no better evidence than an assertion in an intercepted letter, the name of the writer of which does not appear to be known. No one who has read Mr. Bunch's dispatches to your lordship and to me can consider him as in the least degree a partisan of the southern cause. Mr. Seward has, it is true, for some time had a notion, of which I have in vain endeavored to disabuse him, that Mr. Bunch is hostile to the United States; but I could never find that the notion had any better foundation than frivolous representations made to this government that Mr. Bunch was active in forwarding private letters. It is contradicted by the whole tenor of the large public and private correspondence which he has all along kept up with me. It has probably had its origin in Mr. Bunch's endeavors to convey information as frequently as possible to her Majesty's government and to this legation.

When Mr. Seward had finished reading the dispatch I remained silent. After a short pause, I took leave of him courteously and withdrew.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 71.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, November 14, 1861.

SIR: I have the honor now to report the proceedings had in execution of the purpose designated in your dispatch, No. 188, of the 23d of October last. Not being quite clear what course would be the most acceptable to Lord Russell, I decided to ask for a personal interview, which was accorded to me for the 13th, at three-quarters past two o'clock, at the Foreign Office.

I opened the conversation by saying that I had been charged with the duty of communicating to his lordship the views of my government touching the action of Mr. Bunch, and the diversion of his bag, as explained by his note of the 9th of September to me, which I had transmitted to the United States. Not being certain as to the best shape in which to clothe the reply, I had deemed it best to come at once to submit the question to his decision. I was prepared to do that which would be the most acceptable to her Majesty's government. To that end I asked his permission to read to him the contents of your dispatch, No. 108, exactly as I had received it.

I chose to adopt this plan, because I thought that the highly conciliatory tone which pervades that paper might, if presented *ipsissimis verbis*, have some effect in doing away with the impressions so assiduously making here, of the prevalence of a disposition hostile to Great Britain in the government of the United States.

Accordingly I read the dispatch slowly and carefully, and not without feeling. His lordship is by no means a demonstrative man. It is difficult to detect the symptom of any emotion in his countenance; and yet I thought I saw a gleam of satisfaction, and a slight softening of manner throughout the rest of the interview. On laying the paper down, I expressed my gratification at being able to make the communication, and then repeated the proposal to give it shape in writing if he deemed it most advisable to accept it in that manner. His lordship immediately answered that he should be glad to have it made in the form of a regu-

lar communication, and I promised to draw it up in that way. Accordingly, I have embodied the substance, and even most of the letter, of your dispatch in the form of a note, a copy of which I have the honor to forward herewith.

I then remarked that in the meeting I had had with Lord Palmerston the preceding day he had alluded to the reception of news of the revocation of Mr. Bunch's exequatur. I should be glad to know what foundation there was for it, as I had received no notice of the kind. His lordship said that it came in a telegram from Lord Lyons, at the latest moment. In a previous dispatch, dated the 26th, he had mentioned that you had read to him a dispatch which you had addressed to me on the subject, but inasmuch as I said that none such had been received, his lordship inferred that action upon it might have been suspended. He also referred to an answer made by Mr. Bunch, denying the truth of the charge made in the intercepted letter, a copy of which had been made the basis of my complaint of his conduct. I repeated my remark, that I had not heard a syllable of the matter, and added that the drift of the dispatch I had just read indicated no great dissatisfaction with Mr. Bunch's conduct. My latest dispatch from you is dated the 28th, but on observing the absence of that numbered 109, I am led to infer that it must be the one to which Lord Lyons made his reference. In that case, I shall probably receive it by the next steamer.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, November 14, 1861.

MY LORD: In obedience to instructions, I now have the honor to submit to your lordship's consideration the answer of the government of the United States to the note addressed by your lordship to me on the 9th of September last, in reply to a previous note of mine touching the diversion made from its original course of the sealed bag of dispatches of Mr. Robert Bunch, her Majesty's consul at Charleston, a copy of which was immediately forwarded by me for their information. I am directed to say to your lordship that the declarations made in that note with unquestioned candor and freedom, touching the contents of that bag, are entirely satisfactory upon the main point involved in the suggestion I have been instructed to make. It is, therefore, a pleasant duty imposed upon me to express the regret felt by my government at the interruption of the passage of the consular dispatches, which has occurred in consequence of a mistaken suspicion that the agent who transmitted them was abusing the confidence of the two governments. It is hoped that no serious inconvenience resulted from the delay.

It would appear from the explanation made by Mr. Bunch in the letter, a copy of which was annexed to your lordship's note, that by reason of the stoppage of the ordinary modes of conveyance by post, to the benefit of which British subjects are entitled by treaty stipulations, entered into between the two countries, creating great inconvenience to those of them residing in the southern States, he was induced to remedy the evil by inclosing a number of private letters in his official bag. The nature

of the correspondence he also explains in a manner perfectly satisfactory; so that the exceptionable nature of Mr. Bunch's proceedings is reduced to his substitution of his consular bag and official seal for the mail-bag and mail-boxes of the United States, and of his own mail-carrier for the mail-carriers of the United States.

Whatever might be the exception to be taken even to this course in ordinary times, my government is not disposed to urge it under the circumstances which now attend the case. The fact of the interruption of the post, and also that it works literally a non-fulfillment of a treaty stipulation, is admitted and deplored, not simply for that reason, but because of the public and private injuries that it occasions, as well abroad as at home. But it is believed that her Majesty's government is but too well apprised of the truth that this interruption has occurred by no deliberate or voluntary act of its own, but through the sudden violence of an insurrection which has not only obstructed the mails, but which even seeks to overthrow, not only the treaty in question, but even the government itself, and the Union which constitutes the people a treaty-making and treaty-observing nation. Suppression of the correspondence between parties in that insurrection with each other in this country, and in foreign countries, is a measure essential to the suppression of the insurrection itself, and to a complete restoration of the government throughout the Union. It is, then, confidently believed that the known magnanimity of her Majesty's government may be relied upon, not to complain at one and the same time of the breach of our international postal treaty, under such circumstances, and of our resort to a measure which is indispensable to complete the ability to fulfill it.

It is proper for me to add to this exposition, which I have been instructed to submit, the remark that it has been delayed thus long only upon the supposition that Lord Lyons might, under the intimation contained in your lordship's note, be charged with some further communication bearing upon the subject.

I pray your lordship to accept the assurances of the highest consideration with which I have the honor to be your lordship's most obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 4, 1862, p. 21.]

No. 22.

Lord Lyons to Earl Russell.

[Extract.]

WASHINGTON, November 14, 1861.

I have the honor to transmit to your lordship a copy of a dispatch which I have received to-day from Mr. Consul Bunch, and which contains further explanations concerning his conduct with regard to the letters carried by Mr. Robert Mure.

This dispatch touches upon the two points respecting which I am directed by your lordship's dispatch of the 26th ultimo to call for additional explanations from Mr. Bunch. I shall not, however, omit to communicate to him your lordship's orders as soon as I am able to send a ship of war to Charleston.

[Inclosure.]

Consul Bunch to Lord Lyons.

CHARLESTON, October 31, 1861.

MY LORD: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your lordship's dispatch of the 23d instant, together with its inclosure, this latter being a dispatch from Earl Russell, dated September 14, to your lordship, calling for explanations of my conduct with regard to the private letters seized upon Mr. Robert Mure.

Your lordship is so good as to inform me that you have already forwarded to Lord Russell a copy of my dispatch to your lordship, of September 30, in which I explained, as fully as might be, my proceedings in this unfortunate affair. I do not, therefore, propose to trouble your lordship with many additional remarks, but I will venture to sum up, as briefly as I can, the principles which actuated me in the course which I pursued.

When Mr. Mure had determined, early in August, to make his customary voyage to Great Britain, he called on me and offered his services to carry anything that I might have for the Foreign Office. At that time there was no interruption of communication between the northern and the southern States. The mail, it is true, had lately been discontinued, but Adams' Express and private individuals were carrying letters without impediment from the government of the United States.

In reply to Mr. Mure, I remarked that I would be much obliged if he would take charge of a bag for me, as I had no particular faith in the express; the expense, also, would have been a very heavy one. I told Mr. Mure that he must take nothing whatever that could in any way compromise him, such as dispatches from the *de facto* government at Richmond, orders for munitions of war, and the like. He assured me most positively that he would not, but added that he had a few letters from his brother merchants which he could not refuse to carry, and which he felt assured contained nothing to which objection could be taken. As Mr. Mure was not a paid messenger of mine, but only a gentleman who was conferring a favor upon me, I did not consider that your lordship's circular applied to his case. No private letters went under my seal, and I could not possibly suppose that the authorities of the United States would disapprove of his doing what every one else who left for the north was doing daily. I took your lordship's circular of June 20 to apply to messengers, *bond fide* such, and not to ordinary travelers. It is true, that I gave Mr. Mure a document somewhat resembling a passport, for greater security. My dispatches were of importance; and as I had given the same style of document, omitting the words "British merchant," to several other so-called messengers, some of them American-born, without objection, I could not anticipate the unfortunate issue. If I have erred, it has been from excess of precaution and anxiety for the safety of my dispatches, and the event has proved that no improper document was found in my bag.

I have only to add, that the supposed letter respecting my communications to the anonymous writer is a tissue of falsehoods. I never told anybody that I had been "engaged on a treaty of commerce," "that the first step towards recognition was taken," or any such absurdities. It is surely the business of the government of the United States to produce the letter, with the name of its writer. Until this is done, I denounce the statements as calumnies to which I cannot reply. Besides which, I

can scarcely be held responsible for the remarks in a private letter which bears inconsistency and absurdity on its very face, as a very brief examination would show.

I have to beg your lordship to furnish Earl Russell with a copy of these remarks. They are less perfect than I could have wished, but the time allowed by the vessels of war for replies is very short, and I am, moreover, suffering acute pain, which almost incapacitates me from thought.

I have, &c.,

R. BUNCH.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extracts.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, November 15, 1861.

SIR: * * * * *

On Tuesday morning, the 12th, I received an informal note from Lord Palmerston, inviting me, if convenient, to call and see him, at his own house, between 1 and 2 o'clock of that day. I accepted and went. He received me in his library, all alone, and at once opened on the subject then evidently weighing on his mind.

He went on to speak of other information received as to the intention of the government of the United States to revoke the exequatur of Mr. Bunch. He said he did not know but what there might be some reasons satisfactory to the government for taking this course, but it did not appear to him that any solid good was to be gained by it. It was producing irritation—and all for what? So long as Charleston was blockaded and out of the control of the United States, where was the use of changing the consul? What was the office of consul worth to any person now to undertake it? The effect would be more to stir up agitation than anything else, and he could not perceive the benefit that could ensue to either country from that.

Here, I repeated my question as to the grounds he had for believing the truth of the story. His lordship answered that he heard it from Mr. Hammond, the under-secretary at the Foreign Office. In that case, I remarked that there must be some foundation for it. My own impression had been so strong that Mr. Bunch had departed from his proper position of neutrality in our affairs that I should not be surprised if the government of the United States had done what was alleged. All that I could say about it was that no notice of the kind had been given to me. So far as I could judge of the disposition of the administration, from the tone of a dispatch I had just received on the subject, with which Mr. Bunch had been intimately connected, I should infer the existence of any feeling rather than one of irritation with Great Britain about him. The substance of that dispatch I had been directed to communicate to Earl Russell, and I proposed doing so the next day at an interview which I had solicited for the purpose. I begged his lordship to dismiss all idea that my government was not as desirous as her Majesty's ministers could be to raise no needless questions of difference between the two countries; but we had a great many things to try our patience as well as they.

It was impossible for me to witness what I did here in the way of active contribution of supplies, of all sorts, by parties in sympathy with the confederates, not to feel vexed and annoyed at it; neither was it to be denied that the main stay of this conspiracy, that which had kept it in vigor down to this moment, was the hope of an ultimate recognition by this government and by France. The representations, confidently persisted in by their emissaries here, to their people at home, had contributed greatly to stimulate them to persevere. The speech made by Mr. Yancey at the fishmongers' dinner the other day, and the apparent reception it met with, were diligently used in the same sense. It was, therefore, not surprising if among us there were found persons who gave more consequence to these indications than they, perhaps, merited, and who charged upon the whole nation designs which were cherished by comparatively few classes of individuals. All that we had desired was a complete and thorough abstinence on the part of foreign countries, so that we could be left to manage the domestic difficulty for ourselves. Had this object been attained, it was my conviction that the rebellion would have burned out for want of fuel by this time. It was the faith in foreign aid that had kept it up; and the sense of this was the real and only source for what bad feeling had been roused towards England in America.

* * * * *

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

—

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 74.] LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, November 22, 1861.

SIR: I have to acknowledge the reception of the missing dispatch (No. 109) of the 23d of October from the department, which relates, as I had conjectured, to the case of Mr. Bunch, the British consul at Charleston. In conformity with the constructions therein contained, I have addressed a note to Earl Russell on the subject, a copy of which I have the honor to transmit herewith.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

—

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, November 21, 1861.

The undersigned, envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States, has the honor to inform the right honorable Earl Russell, her Majesty's principal secretary of state for foreign affairs, that he has now just received the answer of his government to the note addressed by his lordship to the undersigned on the 9th of September last, touching certain representations made by him under instructions from his government of the conduct of Mr. Robert Bunch, her Majesty's

consul at Charleston, and he now proceeds to submit the substance of the same to his lordship's consideration.

And first, it is a source of satisfaction to the undersigned to be able to say that the President finds that that part of Mr. Bunch's proceedings which was most calculated to offend the United States, and to which exception was more especially taken, has no support in the communication of his lordship to which it is now proposed to reply. If it be true that Mr. Bunch made any assurances, direct or implied, to the insurgents in the United States, of a disposition on the part of her Majesty's government to recognize them as a state, it is now clear that he acted utterly without authority. Whatever is the responsibility which may be supposed to attach to Mr. Bunch for such an act, there is no disposition left to assign the smallest share of it to the source to which he is indebted for his official position.

But though there is great cause for gratification in this view of his lordship's note, the undersigned is constrained to admit that, in another, the President has received it with somewhat less of satisfaction. It would appear that her Majesty's government has avowed that Mr. Bunch did act under instructions, so far as his conduct was known to the foreign department, and that that action went to the extent of communicating to the persons exercising authority in the so-called Confederate States the desire of her Majesty's government that the 2d, 3d, and 4th articles of the declaration of Paris should be observed by these States in the prosecution of the hostilities in which they were engaged.

The undersigned regrets to be obliged to submit to his lordship's consideration the fact, that Mr. Bunch received from the government of the United States a recognition exclusively confined to the performance of consular duties, and that in proceeding to execute others which very nearly approach, if they do not absolutely belong to, those of diplomatic agents only, he seems to them to have transcended the just limits of any authority which they had ever consented to vest in him.

Well aware of the great difficulties necessarily in the way of an intimate acquaintance with the laws of a foreign state, the undersigned will not pretend to claim of her Majesty's government that it should be familiar with those of the United States; but it becomes his duty to point out the fact that Mr. Bunch, in accepting the post which he did under her Majesty's authority, voluntarily made himself amenable, at least during the period of his residence, to the authority of those laws. When, therefore, he received a direction from the foreign department to do an act which was not known by it to be a violation of one of these laws, but which he was bound to know to be such, his duty clearly should have been, instead of proceeding at once in contravention of the law, to apprise his government of the position he was placed in, and to await their decision after a full consideration of the question involved. The statute to which allusion is made forbids, under a heavy penalty, any person not specially appointed, or duly authorized or recognized by the President, whether citizen or denizen, privileged or unprivileged, from counseling, advising, aiding, or assisting in any political correspondence with the government of any foreign state whatever, with an intent to influence the measures of any foreign government, or of any officer or agent thereof, in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of their government.

Neither is the undersigned so fortunate as to see in this proceeding of Mr. Bunch, thus shown to be on his part a wanton violation of the law of the United States, a sufficient justification or excuse in the consideration that Great Britain is deeply interested in the maintenance of the articles which provide that the flag covers the goods, and that the goods

of a neutral taken on board a belligerent ship are not liable to confiscation. It is enough to say on this subject that, in the view of nearly all civilized nations, the proper agents to make known such wishes are the diplomatic, not the consular, agents of a government, and that the only authority in the United States to which any diplomatic communication whatever can be made, is the government of the United States itself. The undersigned is too confident of the soundness of the principles which have ever actuated the government of Great Britain, in all its relations with foreign countries, not to affirm that it would never give countenance for a single moment to the application of any other doctrine than this to the management of its own affairs.

Least of all, will the undersigned be permitted to admit that communication by Mr. Bunch, while exercising consular privileges granted to him with the consent of the United States, with insurgents endeavoring to overthrow the government, can be justified by the declaration of her Majesty's ministers that they have already recognized the belligerent character of those insurgents, and will continue so to consider them. It is, indeed, true that her Majesty's proclamation has been issued for the regulation of all her own subjects, and that it has been interpreted by her government as recognizing the insurgents as a belligerent; but it is equally true that the government of the United States declines to accept any such interpretation as modifying in the least degree its own rights and powers, or the obligations of all friendly nations towards it.

Still adhering to this position, the undersigned is instructed to announce, as the result of the most calm and impartial deliberation upon the question thus submitted for its decision, the necessity which his government feels itself under to revoke the exequatur of Mr. Bunch. Neither has this step been taken without the pressure of a strong conviction that, independently of the facts already alleged, his personal conduct, even down to the time this correspondence has been going on, as well as before it commenced, has been that not of a friend to the government, nor even of a neutral, but of a partizan of faction and disunion.

In conclusion, it is with much pleasure that the undersigned has it in his power to convey to Earl Russell the sense entertained by the President of the action of her Majesty's representative at Washington. It is felt to be due to him, as well as to his government, to say that in all his proceedings he has carefully respected the sovereignty and the rights of the United States, and that the arrangements which have been made by him, with the entire approval of the government, for establishing a communication between his government and its consuls, through the national vessels of Great Britain, entering blockaded ports without carrying passengers or private letters, bid fair to preclude all necessity for a recurrence of such proceedings as those which have necessitated this painful correspondence.

Having thus performed the duty imposed upon him of announcing that the exequatur of Mr. Bunch has been withdrawn, because his services are no longer agreeable to the government of the United States, the undersigned is further instructed to say that the consular privileges thus taken from him will be cheerfully allowed to any successor whom her Majesty may be pleased to appoint, against whom no grave personal objections are known to exist.

The undersigned has the honor to renew to Earl Russell the assurances of the highest consideration with which he is his lordship's most obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. Earl RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 75.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, November 22, 1861.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit a copy of a note of Lord Russell, dated the 15th of this month, in reply to mine addressed to him on the day previous, on the subject of the intercepted bag of Mr. Bunch, a copy of which was sent forward with my dispatch to the department, No. 71, dated the 14th instant.

I have taken no special notice of the closing observations, for the reason, 1st, that his lordship transfers the discussion to Washington; and, 2d, that in another note addressed to him, under instructions, on the case of Mr. Bunch, allusion is incidentally made to the subject as having been already arranged between Lord Lyons and yourself.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *November 15, 1861.*

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your note of the 14th instant, which confirms the statements you made to me orally on Wednesday last.

I have only to add that, believing the cause of the stoppage of Mr. Bunch's bag to have been a *bond fide* suspicion on the part of the United States government that the bag might contain dispatches from the so-styled Confederate States, I did not think it necessary to address Lord Lyons further on the subject.

With respect to your remarks on the subject of correspondence of British subjects in the southern States, the inconveniences consequent upon the present state of things are so great that her Majesty's government are obliged, seriously, to consider whether means may not be found, compatible with the vigorous prosecution of the war, by which those inconveniences may be remedied, at least in part.

Her Majesty's government are, accordingly, occupied in devising measures which, when matured, may afford some hope of redress for the injuries sustained by British subjects in consequence of the present state of things. The measures to be proposed will be communicated, as soon as they are matured, to the Secretary of State of the United States by Lord Lyons.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant.

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 81.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, November 20, 1861.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith the copy of a note addressed by Earl Russell to me on the 26th instant, in reply to mine on the subject

of the revocation of Mr. Bunch's exequatur. I likewise subjoin a copy of my note addressed to him in answer. I have confined myself almost entirely to those portions in which his lordship calls my positions into question, and have left his declarations of future intentions to be dealt with by the government, if it be deemed worth while to continue the discussion. Other matters are so constantly occurring of a more imperative nature as to render this of very secondary consequence.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

Secretary of State.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, November 26, 1861.

The undersigned, her Majesty's principal secretary of state for foreign affairs, has received with much concern the note which Mr. Adams, envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States at this court, addressed to him on the 21st instant, in which he announces, as the result of what Mr. Adams states to have been the calm and impartial deliberation by the United States government upon the question submitted for its decision, the necessity which that government feels itself under to revoke the exequatur of Mr. Robert Bunch, her Majesty's consul at Charleston.

In discussing this matter, the undersigned will put aside the allegations of the unknown letter-writer concerning Mr. Bunch's supposed conversation, referred to in a former communication of Mr. Adams; for it may now be affirmed that those allegations, unsupported as they are by any proof, were entirely unfounded.

Neither will the undersigned take any notice of the charge made against Mr. Bunch, that his conduct has been that of a partisan of faction and disunion, because that charge is equally unsupported by any proof whatever, and is equally unfounded.

The withdrawal of Mr. Bunch's exequatur does not, however, appear to rest upon these unfounded allegations, nor on these groundless charges. It is said to rest upon a law of the United States, of which it is said her Majesty's government might personally have been ignorant, but which Mr. Bunch was bound to have brought to their notice.

This law, as Mr. Adams affirms, "forbids, under a heavy penalty, any person not specially appointed or duly authorized or recognized by the President, whether citizen or denizen, privileged or unprivileged, from counseling, advising, aiding, or assisting in any political correspondence with the government of any foreign state whatever, with an intent to influence the measures of any foreign government, or of any officer or agent thereof, in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of their government."

Taking Mr. Adams's description of this statute as full and accurate, the undersigned has to remark that the statute seems to have been enacted for the purpose of preventing citizens or denizens of the United States from aiding or counseling foreign governments with regard to their disputes with the United States.

If this be so, Mr. Bunch having no mission or instruction to aid or counsel a foreign state at enmity with the United States, and not having

done so, could have no reason to suppose that a statute made *alio intuitu* could be so construed as to apply to his execution of the instructions he had received from her Majesty's government, and therefore there could be no reason why he should have brought to the notice of her Majesty's government an United States statute, which had no bearing whatever upon anything which he was instructed to do.

The undersigned has further to remark that the United States government, by their quotation of the statute in question as the foundation on which they rest their complaint against Mr. Bunch, seem distinctly to admit that the government of the Confederate States at Richmond is, as regards the United States, the government of a foreign state—an admission which goes further than any acknowledgment with regard to those States which her Majesty's government have hitherto made. But if the Confederate States are, as Mr. Adams's note implies, as regards the United States a foreign state, then the President of the United States has no competence one way or the other with respect to the functions of the consuls of other governments in that foreign state, and the exequaturs of such consuls can be granted or withdrawn only by the government of such foreign state; for the Confederate States cannot be at one and the same time "a foreign state" and part of the territory of the United States.

But there is a further question raised by the United States government, which is of deep and urgent importance. Mr. Adams is instructed to say that any communication to be addressed to the government of the so-called Confederate States respecting the goods of a belligerent on board neutral ships, or the goods of a neutral on board belligerent ships, should have been made by diplomatic and not by consular agents, and that the "only authority in the United States to which any diplomatic communication whatever can be made is the government of the United States itself." Mr. Adams must be aware that this assertion raises grave questions both of fact and of law.

In the first place, when her Majesty's government are gravely told that an application to the confederate government for redress ought to be made through the President of the United States, they might well ask whether such a position is seriously laid down, and whether the President of the United States can affirm that, in the present condition of things, he has the power to give effect to any such application which might be made to him. For instance, a British subject at New Orleans or Galveston might be carried away by force to serve with the confederate troops; could the President of the United States set him free? Might he not be killed in battle by a ball or a bullet from the United States army as the only release he could obtain from President Lincoln from his compulsory service? Again, the private debts due to a British subject in Louisiana or Arkansas may be confiscated and paid into the public treasury of the State by a law or decree of the so-styled confederate congress; could the President or Secretary of State of the United States obtain the recovery of these sums? or could he secure immunity from confiscation for the landed property of British subjects in the eleven Confederate States?

If the President of the United States cannot do this, the course of proceeding suggested by Mr. Adams would be altogether illusory.

But next, as to a question of international law, her Majesty's government hold it to be an undoubted principle of international law, that when the persons or property of the subjects or citizens of a state are injured by a *de facto* government, the state so aggrieved has a right to claim from the *de facto* government redress and reparation; and also that, in

cases of apprehended loss or injury to their subjects, states may lawfully enter into communication with *de facto* governments to provide for the temporary security of the persons and property of their subjects.

Acting upon this last-mentioned principle, her Majesty's government entered into concert with the government of the Emperor of the French in regard to certain articles of the declaration of Paris. The result was an instruction, which was to be carried into effect by the British and French consuls at Charleston, and they both executed their commission unostentatiously, but effectively. It may be necessary in future, for the protection of the interests of her Majesty's subjects in the vast extent of country which resists the authority of the United States, to have further communication, both with the central authority at Richmond, and with the governors of the separate States; and in such cases such communications will continue to be made, but such communications will not imply any acknowledgment of the confederates as an independent state.

The undersigned has read with sincere pleasure the testimony voluntarily borne by the President of the United States to the care with which Lord Lyons has respected the sovereignty and the rights of the United States; and the undersigned feels it right to say that, in very difficult circumstances, the conduct of Mr. Adams, while upholding the authority and interests of his own government, has been such as to acquire the esteem and respect of the government of her Majesty and of the British nation.

The undersigned requests Mr. Adams to accept the assurance of his highest consideration.

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, November 20, 1861.

The undersigned, envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States, has the honor to acknowledge the reception of a note from the right honorable Earl Russell, her Majesty's principal secretary of state for foreign affairs, dated the 26th instant, in answer to a previous one of his own dated the 21st instant, announcing the decision of the government of the United States to withdraw the exequatur of Mr. Bunch, her Majesty's consul at Charleston, in South Carolina. The undersigned will do himself the honor to transmit his lordship's note for the information of his government by the first opportunity.

The undersigned, disclaiming any desire to continue discussion upon a painful topic one moment longer than a necessity for it shall continue to exist, yet feels as if he could not, in justice to himself, as well as to his own government, omit this opportunity to explain some passages of his former note, which appear to him to have been in a degree misunderstood by Earl Russell. He confesses himself at a loss to comprehend in what manner he should have been so unfortunate in his use of language as to give ground for his lordship's statement "that the United States government, by their quotation of the statute to which reference has been made, as the foundation on which they rest their complaint against Mr. Bunch, seem deliberately to admit that the government of the Confederate States at Richmond is, as regards the United States, the government of a foreign state, an admission which goes further than any

acknowledgment with regard to those States which her Majesty's government have heretofore made." If the undersigned has given just cause for any construction of the action of his government approximating to that indicated in the preceding extract from his lordship's note, then has he indeed committed, in his estimation, a most grave mistake. But on a careful re-examination of his note of the 21st, the undersigned must be permitted to say that he has found some difficulty in perceiving anything that appears to him to be ambiguity in his meaning. He discovers only one government of a foreign state alluded to, and that is obviously her Majesty's government. The other party, in his own mind, were the rebellious insurgents in arms against the authority of the United States, which he was very far from characterizing in the manner indicated by his lordship. The purpose of the law seems to the undersigned to have been severely to punish all persons, whether native or foreign, citizen or privileged, who knowingly made themselves instruments of foreign states to foment factious disturbances within the United States. It appears to have been enacted during the troubled period of the French revolution, when interference with the domestic affairs of neighboring nations was an avowed principle of action, and was, therefore, boldly acted upon, even by the recognized agents of the French authorities. The undersigned, therefore, in applying the principle of the law in a mitigated form to Mr. Bunch and his alleged intermixture with the disputes and controversies going on within the United States, surely cannot have made so great a mistake as to have assumed that he was dealing with "the government of a foreign state." He has considered Mr. Bunch as an officer of her Majesty's government, formally recognized by the government of the United States for certain purposes of commerce, who has been engaged in political correspondence, as well with his own government as with rebellious insurgents in the United States, for purposes foreign from those which were assigned at the time he received his authority, and for that reason that he has knowingly violated the law. At the same time the undersigned took great care in expressing his firm belief that her Majesty's government, in directing their agent in the manner indicated, could not have been aware of the nature and character of that law; a belief which he is happy to find by his lordship's present mode of considering it to have been well founded.

But much as the undersigned found of difficulty in regard to the misconception he has been so unfortunate as to originate in his lordship's mind of his view of a law of his own country, he has been still more embarrassed to learn the fact that in his statement of what appeared to his mind true in its application to all governments, and undeniable in respect to the government of the United States, he has not enjoyed the satisfaction of his lordship's concurrence in opinion. This statement was, that "the only authority in the United States to which any diplomatic communication whatever can be made is the government of the United States." If the undersigned had been led in any way to vary this proposition, he would have deemed himself to have gone much farther in the road to recognition of "the government of a foreign state" within the United States than he did in that mistakenly attributed to him by his lordship. Surely it could not have been his lordship's intention to present the proposition that the same diplomatic agent of a foreign power can be accredited to the government of a country, and to the self-constituted authorities of a portion of the people who are waging war to overthrow it. Applying this argument to the question of Mr. Bunch, his case resolves itself into this: that holding his authority to act in an official relation as an officer of a foreign government from the

recognition of the authorities of the United States, they are expected to acknowledge his right while acting in this capacity, at the same time to treat with any of their own citizens who defy their authority whenever it may be deemed advisable by that government. Surely such a proposition, if accepted, would seem to undermine the foundations of sound international relationship all over the world. Surely no government, entertaining a proper degree of self-respect, would consent for a moment to receive any representative of a foreign nation if his first act might be to attempt to undermine the authority to which he had been accredited, by recognizing for any purpose the validity of a domestic antagonism within its limits.

The undersigned is not insensible to the force of his lordship's argument in regard to the necessity imposed upon it of protecting the interests of British subjects in those regions where the authority of the United States is suspended, as well as to the difficulty of calling upon the government of the United States to make good the damage that might ensue from the acts of persons now in armed resistance. Doubtless it must have been under considerations like these that her Majesty's government was induced to release that of the United States from responsibility for such reclamations, by adopting the policy of granting to the insurgents the rights of a belligerent. Without entering into the wide field of discussion presented by the arguments of his lordship, the undersigned contents himself with the remark that, whatever may be the course of action her Majesty's government deem proper to lay down for itself in regulating its relations with the insurgent forces in the United States, it will scarcely be disposed to require of the government of the United States that it should recognize the agents through whom they may be carried on. The objection to Mr. Bunch's action is, that while he has been enjoying, as consul of her Majesty in the United States, the advantages of a solemn recognition of the United States, he has been engaged in official proceedings in violation of the law, as well as outside of any authority with which they ever consented that he should be vested.

That the latter part of this statement is the fact would scarcely seem to admit of the possibility of a doubt. But inasmuch as the undersigned is not altogether sure that he has placed the matter so fully before his lordship as his duty to his country seems to him to require, he trusts he may be permitted to enlarge upon it a little farther. The position of Mr. Bunch in regard to the United States had been exclusively that of a consul of a foreign nation at a commercial port. That such a position does not of itself involve the right of diplomatic negotiation with the recognizing government, much less with any subordinate authority, is too well established law to need further elucidation.

The only question that remains for consideration is, then, whether the authority actually vested in Mr. Bunch by her Majesty's government to enter into communication with the insurgents in the United States touching certain articles of the declaration of Paris, to which their acquiescence was to be obtained, was of a diplomatic or purely of a consular nature. The proper answer to this is to be found in an appeal to the mode in which, from its very commencement, the declaration of Paris has been permitted to take its shape. In its origin it was the result of a conference of the accredited envoys of the great powers; and in all the later steps taken to secure the acquiescence of different nations, including the United States, the agency used has been that of the customary diplomatic representatives. It, therefore, admits of no doubt in the mind of the undersigned that the declaration of Paris is a pure

diplomatic act, and that all negotiations since carried on to extend its authority, including that which the undersigned himself had the honor to carry on with his lordship for a time, bear the same exclusive character. It is, therefore, plain to the mind of the undersigned that the government of the United States in objecting to the assumption, by an officer of a foreign government recognized by it only as vested with the authority of a consul, of diplomatic authority to treat within the limits of the United States, and without its knowledge or consent, with persons acting in armed resistance to it, has justification fully sufficient to sustain its decision to withdraw the formal act of recognition of such officer. To suppose it capable of a different course would seem to be to condemn it as unworthy of the character for honor and independence to which it has ever endeavored to aspire.

In conclusion, the undersigned desires to express his personal obligations to Earl Russell for the friendly notice he has been pleased to take of his labors in the arduous and difficult mission with which he has been charged. It gives him great pleasure to be able on his part to testify to the uniform courtesy and good will with which he has been treated in all his relations with her Majesty's government.

The undersigned prays Earl Russell to receive the assurances of his most distinguished consideration.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. Earl RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 136.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, November 30, 1861.

SIR:

Secondly. The communication of the British and French governments to the insurgent cabal at Richmond, through Mr. Bunch, was a proceeding that could not fail to alarm the American government and people. When the fact happened to become known to us, I had just become satisfied, though in confidential communications, that the British government was prepared to assume a tone that should repel the prevailing presumption of its inclinations to a recognition. But the offensive correspondence of the British government left us no alternative but to exercise our right to revoke the *exequatur* of the offending consul. It was done, however, upon the grounds of his having rendered himself personally obnoxious.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 84.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,

London, December 6, 1861.

SIR:

Yesterday I received from Lord Russell a note in answer to mine of the

29th ultimo, on the case of Mr. Bunch. Although the matter is really closed, I thought it advisable to record a reply. Copies of both papers are transmitted herewith.

* * * * *

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, December 4, 1861.

The undersigned, her Majesty's principal secretary of state for foreign affairs, has had the honor to receive a note from Mr. Adams, envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States at this court, of the 29th ultimo, upon the contents of which some explanation is due to Mr. Adams. Very pressing business has alone delayed this explanation.

Mr. Adams states that his meaning has been quite misunderstood. "But," Mr. Adams goes on to say, "on a careful re-examination of his note of the 21st, the undersigned must be permitted to say that he has found some difficulty in perceiving anything that appears to him to be ambiguity in his meaning. He discovers only one government of a foreign state alluded to, and that is obviously her Majesty's government. The other party in his own mind were the rebellious insurgents in arms against the authority of the United States, which he was very far from characterizing in the manner indicated by his lordship. The purpose of the law seems to the undersigned to have been severely to punish all persons, whether native or foreign, citizen or privileged, who knowingly made themselves instruments of foreign states to foment factious disturbances within the United States. It appears to have been enacted during the troubled period of the French revolution, when interference with the domestic affairs of neighboring nations was an avowed principle of action, and was, therefore, boldly acted upon even by the recognized agents of the French authorities."

The undersigned must be permitted to say that, with this explanation, the law in question appears to him still less applicable to the case of Mr. Bunch than it did before. The description of that law is given by Mr. Adams in his former letter in the following words:

"The statute to which allusion is made forbids, under a heavy penalty, any person, not especially appointed or duly authorized or recognized by the President, whether citizen or denizen, privileged or unprivileged, from counseling, advising, aiding or assisting, in any political correspondence with the government of any foreign state whatever, with an intent to influence the measures of any foreign government, or of any officer or agent thereof, in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of their government."

It now appears that the foreign government alluded to is the British government, and the offense with which Mr. Bunch is charged is that he advised, aided, or assisted the British government, with an intent to influence the measures of the British government "in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of their government."

Now, upon such a charge, Mr. Bunch must be at once acquitted. He has not advised or assisted the British government "in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of their government."

Mr. Bunch has assisted the foreign government by which he is employed to obtain from a *de facto* authority proper and requisite protection for British ships and for British merchandise embarked in ships of the United States.

It is only necessary to make this statement in order to show that the spirit of the statute quoted is still more inapplicable to the conduct of Mr. Bunch than its own words and its letter.

The purport and spirit of that statute enacted during the troubled period of the French revolution was to afford the means of checking interference with the domestic affairs of the United States.

Her Majesty's government, who are, it appears, the foreign government referred to, have never interfered with the domestic affairs of the United States, and they have never instructed or authorized any diplomatic or consular agent of her Majesty to interfere with these domestic affairs.

But, while her Majesty's government explicitly disclaim all such interference, they as explicitly claim the right of protecting the lives and property of British subjects, wherever and by whomsoever their lives and properties may be threatened or attacked or injured.

In order to do so with effect, it is sometimes necessary to communicate with the *de facto* authorities of a port or province or a state. To give a recent instance, in the course of last year Sicily was occupied by the troops of the King of the Two Sicilies, by the volunteer forces of Garibaldi, and by the army of the King of Italy. During these transactions the property of the Queen's subjects at Marsala was thought to be in danger. Her Majesty's government did not stop to inquire whether Garibaldi was the lawful dictator of Sicily, or whether the insurgent Sicilians were rebels against the legitimate sovereignty of Francis the Second. They interposed at once, by remonstrance and by the presence of her Majesty's ships, against the threatened or presumed violence. This is a right which belongs to every state, and her Majesty's government will exercise it on behalf of her Majesty's subjects whenever they see occasion to do so; but they will at the same time abstain from any interference in the domestic troubles of friendly states.

The undersigned requests Mr. Adams to accept the assurance of his highest consideration.

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,

London, December 6, 1861.

The undersigned, envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States, has the honor to acknowledge the reception of the note of the right honorable Earl Russell, her Majesty's principal secretary of state for foreign affairs, of the 4th instant, in answer to his own of the 29th ultimo touching the case of Mr. Bunch, her Majesty's consul at Charleston. The undersigned has read the additional exposition made by his lordship of the bearing of the law of the United States,

which has been under consideration, on the question at issue, with the deepest attention, and he has applied himself to a careful re-examination of all the provisions of the law itself, with an anxious desire to see it in a light which may acquit Mr. Bunch. But it is with great regret that he is again forced to the conclusion that, in consenting to assist her Majesty's government in carrying on a negotiation which, however little intended by that government, he could not in his situation fail to know would have an unfavorable effect upon the measures of the government of the United States in the disputes and controversies in which it was involved, he clearly brought himself within the scope of the statute. And in further consenting, while holding a purely consular trust under the recognition of the government of the United States, to accept a labor of diplomatic negotiation with persons in open resistance to the regularly constituted authorities of the nation, without first apprising the government of her Majesty of the existence of a prohibition like that now in question, which certainly throws a shade of doubt upon the propriety of such a course, he has willfully assumed a responsibility for which the government must hold him exclusively accountable, at least so far as to withdraw the authority under which he has heretofore acted as a public officer with their approbation.

The undersigned takes great pleasure in noting the assurances given in his note by Earl Russell that her Majesty's government have no disposition to interfere with the domestic affairs of the United States. He has himself at no time entertained a suspicion that it was otherwise. Neither was it ever in his contemplation to venture to present any proposition for the regulation of her Majesty's government in the difficult circumstances in which he is ready to admit they have been placed. Neither does he propose to question the right of that government to take measures for the protection "of the lives and the properties of her Majesty's subjects wherever they may be threatened or attacked or injured." He certainly would not deny to any other responsible nation the same extent of power in that contingency which he should ever be ready to claim for his own. So far as the undersigned is able to understand the present question, however, it does not appear in any way to involve a consideration of that subject. One of the grounds of dissatisfaction with the conduct of Mr. Bunch is, that while holding her Majesty's commission as consul under the recognition of the government of the United States, he has at the same time been employed in a diplomatic negotiation with persons in armed resistance to their authority. In this it would appear that he has been acting under instructions from her Majesty's government. It is certainly competent to that government to assume such a responsibility if it thinks proper. But the undersigned must be permitted to remark that a corresponding responsibility appears to him thereby to devolve upon the government which he has the honor to represent, and that is not by continuing its own recognition to the officer selected as the agent to conduct these extraordinary negotiations with persons in arms against itself, after the facts have been brought to its knowledge, to give rise to an implication of a doubt of its own rightful authority.

For these reasons, as well as for the others heretofore given in the course of this, to the undersigned, very painful correspondence, it becomes his duty to announce that the exequatur, formerly granted by his government to Mr. Robert Bunch, has been withdrawn.

The undersigned desires to renew to Earl Russell the assurances of his highest consideration.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. Earl RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

[From the British Blue Book, "North America," 1862, No. 1, p. 115.]

No. 130.

Lord Lyons to Earl Russell.

[Extract.]

WASHINGTON, December 6, 1861.

I have the honor to transmit to your lordship a copy of the papers relating to foreign affairs which were laid before Congress with the President's message.

* * * * *

At page 126 appears a dispatch* to Mr. Adams identical with, or very closely resembling, that announcing the revocation of Mr. Consul Bunch's exequatur, which was read to me by Mr. Seward on the 26th of October last. I communicated as much of it as I could recollect to your lordship in my dispatch of the 28th of that month. I observe that in one part of his dispatch Mr. Seward states that the government "must revoke" the exequatur; and in another he desires Mr. Adams to inform your lordship that the exequatur has been withdrawn. I have no reason to suppose that the formal act revoking the exequatur has yet been signed. When the exequaturs of three British consuls were revoked in 1856, the form adopted was that of letters patent published in the newspapers, in the same way in which exequaturs are published. This is, I believe, the usual practice. I have not observed in the newspapers any such letters patent with regard to Mr. Bunch's exequatur. I have not received any notice of such letters having been signed. Indeed, I have no official knowledge of there having been any intention to revoke Mr. Bunch's exequatur.

* * * * *

I have not time to make sure of the fact before the departure of my messenger, but I am nearly certain that eventually the exequatur of the Russian consul, mentioned in the second paragraph of page 53, was not revoked.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 87.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, December 12, 1861.

SIR: I have to acknowledge the reception of dispatches from the department, numbered from 128 to 133, both inclusive.

* * * * *

I transmit a copy of a note from his lordship in reply to mine of the 6th instant, on the case of Mr. Robert Bunch, which closes the correspondence on that subject.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

* See dispatch from Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams, No. 109, October 23, 1861, *anti*.

*Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.*FOREIGN OFFICE, *December 9, 1861.*

The undersigned, her Majesty's principal secretary of state for foreign affairs, has had the honor to receive the note of Mr. Adams, envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States at this court, of the 6th instant, in answer to his note of the 4th.

Mr. Bunch has certainly, in pursuance of the orders of her Majesty's government, placed himself in communication with persons in arms against the United States government. The undersigned has already explained the reasons for which such orders were given, and he regrets to find that the conduct of Mr. Bunch, which the undersigned considers not only legitimate but praiseworthy, has appeared blamable to Mr. Adams and the government of the United States. But the undersigned does not perceive that any advantage would be obtained by the continuance of this correspondence.

The undersigned requests Mr. Adams to accept the assurances of his highest consideration.

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 4, 1862, p. 27.]

No. 28.

*Lord Lyons to Earl Russell.*WASHINGTON, *December 23, 1861.*

MY LORD: I observe in the note from Mr. Adams of the 21st ultimo, that it is stated that Mr. Bunch's exequatur has been withdrawn. With regard to this statement, I can only repeat the remark which I made in my dispatch of the 6th instant, that no notice has been given to me of the withdrawal, nor has any notification of it appeared in the newspapers. I presume that the usual form of revocation is that which was adopted in 1856, when the exequaturs of the three British consuls were withdrawn by letters patent published in the newspapers; but this step has not been taken, and I have still no official knowledge, except from the passage in Mr. Adams's note above alluded to, even of the intention of the government to withdraw the exequatur.

I have, &c.,

LYONS.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 4, 1862, p. 27.]

No. 29.

Lord Lyons to Earl Russell.

[Extract.]

WASHINGTON, *December 31, 1861.*

I have the honor to inform your lordship that Mr. Seward mentioned to me, in conversation yesterday, that Mr. Bunch's exequatur, as her Majesty's consul at Charleston, was actually revoked some time ago.

The fact of the revocation was, I perceive, formally announced to your lordship by Mr. Adams in a note dated the 6th instant, of which you have done me the honor to send me a copy.

I do not think that I should be right, in the absence of orders from your lordship, either to communicate the fact officially to Mr. Bunch, or to give him positive instructions concerning it. But I shall acquaint him confidentially with what has occurred, and advise him to abstain from performing consular acts, the validity of which would be likely to be disputed by this government. I shall, however, recommend him to remain at Charleston, and to make no unnecessary change in his demeanor, until he receive instructions from your lordship. His vice-consul will be able to sign such papers as are required for use in these States.

The obstruction of the entrance to Charleston harbor, by the vessels sunk by the United States, will probably render it in any event necessary to select some other point to which to send her Majesty's ships to keep up the communication with the consuls in the Southern States. In this respect, therefore, the withdrawal of Mr. Bunch's exequatur will not, perhaps, cause any particular inconvenience. But I confess that I should greatly regret being deprived of the very valuable information which he furnishes on the state of affairs in the South. Nor would it be easy to conduct the ordinary business of the consulate, which is now often of a difficult and delicate character, if the consul were a man of less experience and less local influence than Mr. Bunch.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 4, 1862, p. 27.]

No. 30.

Earl Russell to Lord Lyons.

[Extract.]

FOREIGN OFFICE, *January 18, 1862.*

With regard to your dispatch of the 31st ultimo, drawing my attention to the revocation of the exequatur of Mr. Bunch, I have to observe—

1. Her Majesty's government do not dispute the right of the government of the United States to withdraw the exequatur of Mr. Consul Bunch, although her Majesty's government are of opinion that there was no sufficient ground for that act of authority.

2. The vice-consul can, as you suggest, sign such papers as are required for use in the United States.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 2, 1863, p. 2.]

No. 3.

Mr. Mason to Earl Russell.

[Extract.]

54 DEVONSHIRE STREET, PORTLAND PLACE,
London, July 7, 1862.

MY LORD: I am instructed by a recent dispatch from the secretary of state of the Confederate States of America, to bring to the attention of

12 A C—VOL. I

your lordship what would seem to be an addition engrafted by her Majesty's government on the principle of the law of blockade, as established by the convention of Paris in 1856, and accepted by the Confederate States of America, at the invitation of her Majesty's government.

In the instructions to me the text of the convention of Paris is quoted in the following words:

"Blockades, in order to be binding, must be effective—that is to say, maintained by a force sufficient really to prevent access to the coast of the enemy."

And the dispatch of the secretary of state then proceeds:

"The Confederate States, after being recognized as a belligerent power by the governments of France and Great Britain, were informally requested by both those powers to accede to this declaration, as being a correct exposition of international law. Thus invited, this government yielded its assent."

* * * * *

I am, &c.,

J. M. MASON.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 2, 1863, p. 12.]

No. 12.

Mr. Mason to Earl Russell.

[Extract.]

24 UPPER SEYMOUR STREET, PORTMAN SQUARE,
January, 1863.

MY LORD: In a communication which I had the honor to address to your lordship, dated on the 7th July ultimo, I said:

"I am instructed by a recent dispatch from the secretary of state of the Confederate States of America to bring to the attention of your lordship what would seem to be an addition engrafted by her Majesty's government on the principle of the law of blockade, as established by the Convention of Paris in 1856, and accepted by the Confederate States of America at the invitation of her Majesty's government."

* * * * *

I have now, within a few days past, received a dispatch from the secretary of state, in reply to mine of the 4th of August, the tenor of which I am directed to communicate to your lordship.

I am instructed to say that, from the papers thus submitted, it would appear to the President that the government of her Majesty, after having invited the government of the Confederate States to concur in the adoption of certain principles of international law, and after having obtained its assent, assumed in official dispatches to derogate from the principles thus adopted, to the prejudice of the interests and rights of the confederacy; and that upon being approached, in respectful and temperate terms, with a request for explanation on a matter of such deep concern to the confederation, that cabinet refuses a reply.

That her Majesty's government can have no just ground for refusing the explanation asked, because of the absence of the recognition of the independence of the Confederate States by the other nations of the world. It was not in the character of a recognized independent nation, but in that of a recognized belligerent, that the two leading powers of Western Europe approached the government of those States with a proposition

for the adoption of certain principles of public law, as rules which shall govern the mutual relations between the people of the confederacy as belligerents, and the nations of Europe as neutrals, during the pending war.

I have, &c.,

J. M. MASON.

DEMAND FOR REVOCATION OF REBEL BELLIGERENCY.

Mr. Seward to Mr Adams.

[Extracts.]

No. 10.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 21, 1861.

SIR: This government considers that our relations in Europe have reached a crisis, in which it is necessary for it to take a decided stand, on which not only its immediate measures, but its ultimate and permanent policy can be determined and defined. At the same time it neither means to menace Great Britain nor to wound the susceptibilities of that or any other European nation. That policy is developed in this paper.

The paper itself is not to be read or shown to the British secretary of state, nor are any of its positions to be prematurely, unnecessarily, or indiscreetly made known; but its spirit will be your guide. You will keep back nothing when the time arrives for its being said with dignity, propriety, and effect; and you will all the while be careful to say nothing that will be incongruous or inconsistent with the views which it contains.

Mr. Dallas, in a brief dispatch of May 2, (No. 333,) tells us that Lord John Russell recently requested an interview with him on account of the solicitude which his lordship felt concerning the effect of certain measures represented as likely to be adopted by the President. In that conversation the British secretary told Mr. Dallas that the three representatives of the southern confederacy were then in London; that Lord John Russell had not yet seen them, but that he was not unwilling to see them unofficially. He further informed Mr. Dallas that an understanding exists between the British and French governments, which would lead both to take one and the same course as to recognition. His lordship then referred to the rumor of a meditated blockade by us of southern ports, and a discontinuance of them as ports of entry. Mr. Dallas answered that he knew nothing on those topics, and therefore could say nothing. He added that you were expected to arrive in two weeks. Upon this statement Lord John Russell acquiesced in the expediency of waiting for the full knowledge you were expected to bring.

Mr. Dallas transmitted to us some newspaper reports of ministerial explanations made in Parliament.

You will base no proceedings on parliamentary debates further than to seek explanations, when necessary, and communicate them to this department.

The President regrets that Mr. Dallas did not protest against the proposed unofficial intercourse between the British government and the missionaries of the insurgents. It is due, however, to Mr. Dallas to say that our instructions had been given only to you and not to him, and that his loyalty and fidelity, too rare in these times, are appreciated.

Intercourse of any kind with the so-called commissioners is liable to be construed as a recognition of the authority which appointed them. Such intercourse would be none the less hurtful to us for being called unofficial, and it might be even more injurious, because we should have no means of knowing what points might be resolved by it. Moreover, unofficial intercourse is useless and meaningless if it is not expected to ripen into official intercourse and direct recognition. It is left doubtful here whether the proposed unofficial intercourse has yet actually begun. Your own antecedent instructions are deemed explicit enough, and it is hoped that you have not misunderstood them. You will, in any event, desist from all intercourse whatever, unofficial as well as official, with the British government, so long as it shall continue intercourse of either kind with the domestic enemies of this country. When intercourse shall have been arrested for this cause, you will communicate with this department and receive further directions.

Lord John Russell has informed us of an understanding between the British and French governments, that they will act together in regard to our affairs. This communication, however, loses something of its value, from the circumstance that the communication was withheld until after knowledge of the fact had been acquired by us from other sources. We know also another fact that has not yet been officially communicated to us, namely: That other European states are apprised by France and England of their agreement, and are expected to concur with or follow them in whatever measures they adopt on the subject of recognition. The United States have been impartial and just in all their conduct toward the several nations of Europe. They will not complain, however, of the combination now announced by the two leading powers, although they think they had a right to expect a more independent, if not a more friendly, course from each of them. You will take no notice of that or any other alliance. Whenever the European governments shall see fit to communicate directly with us, we shall be, as heretofore, frank and explicit in our reply.

As to the blockade, you will say that by our own laws and the laws of nature, and the laws of nations, this government has a clear right to suppress insurrection. An exclusion of commerce from national ports which have been seized by insurgents, in the equitable form of blockade, is a proper means to that end. You will not insist that our blockade is to be respected if it be not maintained by a competent force; but passing by that question as not now a practical or at least an urgent one, you will add that the blockade is now, and it will continue to be, so maintained, and therefore we expect it to be respected by Great Britain. You will add that we have already revoked the exequatur of a Russian consul who had enlisted in the military service of the insurgents, and we shall dismiss or demand the recall of every foreign agent, consular or diplomatic, who shall either disobey the federal laws or disown the federal authority.

As to the recognition of the so-called Southern Confederacy, it is not to be made a subject of technical definition. It is, of course, direct recognition to publish an acknowledgment of the sovereignty and independence of a new power. It is direct recognition to receive its ambassadors, ministers, agents, or commissioners officially. A concession of belligerent rights is liable to be construed as a recognition of them. No one of these proceedings will pass unquestioned by the United States in this case.

Hitherto recognition has been moved only on the assumption that the so-called Confederate States are *de facto* a self-sustaining power. Now,

after long forbearance, designed to soothe discontent and avert the need of civil war, the land and naval forces of the United States have been put in motion to repress insurrection. The true character of the pretended new state is at once revealed. It is seen to be a power existing in pronouncement only. It has never won a field. It has obtained no forts that were not virtually betrayed into its hands or seized in breach of trust. It commands not a single port on the coast nor any highway out from its pretended capital by land. Under these circumstances, Great Britain is called upon to intervene and give it body and independence by resisting our measures of suppression. British recognition would be British intervention, to create within our territory a hostile state, by overthrowing this republic itself.

As to the treatment of privateers in the insurgent service, you will say that this is a question exclusively our own. We treat them as pirates. They are our own citizens, or persons employed by our citizens, preying on the commerce of our country. If Great Britain shall choose to recognize them as lawful belligerents, and give them shelter from our pursuit and punishment, the laws of nations afford an adequate and proper remedy.

Happily, however, her Britannic Majesty's government can avoid all these difficulties. It invited us in 1856 to accede to the declaration of the congress of Paris, of which body Great Britain was herself a member, abolishing privateering everywhere in all cases and forever. You already have our authority to propose to her our accession to that declaration: If she refuse it, it can only be because she is willing to become the patron of privateering when aimed at our devastation.

These positions are not elaborately defended now, because to vindicate them would imply a possibility of our waiving them.

We are not insensible of the grave importance of this occasion. We see how, upon the result of the debate in which we are engaged, a war may ensue between the United States and one, two, or even more European nations. War in any case is as exceptional from the habits as it is revolting from the sentiments of the American people. But if it come it will be fully seen that it results from the action of Great Britain, not our own; that Great Britain will have decided to fraternize with our domestic enemy either without waiting to hear from you our remonstrances and our warnings, or after having heard them. War in defense of national life is not immoral, and war in defense of independence is an inevitable part of the discipline of nations.

The dispute will be between the European and the American branches of the British race. All who belong to that race will especially deprecate it, as they ought. It may well be believed that men of every race and kindred will deplore it. A war not unlike it between the same parties occurred at the close of the last century. Europe atoned by forty years of suffering for the error that Great Britain committed in provoking that contest. If that nation shall now repeat the same great error, the social convulsions which will follow may not be so long, but they will be more general. When they shall have ceased, it will, we think, be seen, whatever may have been the fortunes of other nations, that it is not the United States that will have come out of them with its precious Constitution altered, or its honestly obtained dominions in any degree abridged: Great Britain has but to wait a few months, and all her present inconveniences will cease with all our own troubles. If she take a different course she will calculate for herself the ultimate as well as the immediate consequences, and will consider what position she will hold when she shall have forever lost the sympathies and affections of the only nation on

whose sympathies and affections she has a natural claim. In making that calculation she will do well to remember that in the controversy she proposes to open we shall be actuated by neither pride, nor passion, nor cupidity, nor ambition; but we shall stand simply on the principle of self-preservation, and that our cause will involve the independence of nations and the rights of human nature.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extracts.]

No. 2.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, May 21, 1861.

SIR: At the close of my last dispatch I stated my purpose to ask an early interview with Lord John Russell. A note to that effect was immediately sent to the Foreign Office. An answer was received on Saturday morning, saying that his lordship would be happy to see me, if I would take the trouble to go out to Pembroke Lodge, at Richmond, where he is retired for the present, on Monday at twelve or one o'clock, or, if I preferred it, he would see me at one o'clock on that same day, (May 18.) Although it was approaching eleven o'clock when I got the answer, and the distance exceeds nine miles from the city, I replied by accepting the earlier appointment, and was probably myself at the Lodge before he received my note.

Be this as it may, I found his lordship ready to receive me, so that I proceeded at once to business. After expressing the general feeling which I believed prevailing in the United States of good will towards Great Britain, and the confident expectations I had entertained, down to the period of my arrival, that these sentiments were fully reciprocated to my government on the part of the government here, I signified my sense of disappointment in not finding this quite so unequivocally manifested as I had hoped. There were now fewer topics of direct difference between the two countries than had probably existed at any preceding time, and even these had been withdrawn from discussion at this place to be treated on the other side of the water. I therefore came out here with little to do beyond the duty of preserving the relations actually existing from the risk of being unfavorably affected by the unfortunate domestic disturbances prevailing in my own country. It was not without pain that I was compelled to admit that from the day of my arrival I had felt in the proceedings of both houses of Parliament, in the language of her Majesty's ministers, and in the tone of opinion prevailing in private circles, more of uncertainty about this than I had before thought possible. This sentiment alone would have impelled me to solicit an early interview; but I was now come under a much stronger motive. I had just received a dispatch from my government, based upon a letter from Mr. Dallas, of much earlier date than any of the matters to which I had alluded. In that letter he had reported a conversation with his lordship, the close of which had been deemed so unsatisfactory that I had been directed at once to seek for a further elucidation of his meaning. It was the desire of my government to learn whether it was the intention of her Majesty's ministers to adopt a policy which

would have the effect to widen, if not to make irreparable, a breach which we believed yet to be entirely manageable by ourselves.

At this point his lordship replied by saying that there was no such intention. The clearest evidence of that was to be found in the assurance given by him to Mr. Dallas in the earlier part of the conversation referred to. With regard to the other portion, against which I understood him to intimate he had already heard from Lord Lyons that the President had taken exception, he could only say that he hardly saw his way to bind the government to any specific course, when circumstances beyond their agency rendered it difficult to tell what might happen. Should the insurgent States ultimately succeed in establishing themselves in an independent position, of the probability of which he desired to express no opinion, he presumed, from the general course of the United States heretofore, that they did not mean to require of other countries to pledge themselves to go further than they had been in the habit of going themselves. He therefore, by what he had said to Mr. Dallas, simply meant to say that they were not disposed in any way to interfere.

To this I replied by begging leave to remark that, so far as my government was concerned, any desire to interfere had never been imputed to Great Britain; but in her peculiar position it was deserving of grave consideration whether great caution was not to be used in adopting any course that might, even in the most indirect way, have an effect to encourage the hopes of the disaffected in America. It had now come to this, that without support from here, the people of the United States considered the termination of this difficulty as almost entirely a question of time. Any course adopted here that would materially change that calculation would inevitably raise the most unpleasant feelings among them; for independently of the absolute influence of Great Britain, admitted to be great, the effect of any supposed inclination on her part could not fail to be extensive among the other nations of Europe. It was my belief that the insurgent States could scarcely hope for sympathy on this side of the Atlantic, if deprived of any prospect of it here. Hence anything that looked like a manifestation of it would be regarded among us as inevitably tending to develop an ultimate separation in America; and, whether intended or not, the impression made would scarcely be effaced by time. It was in this view that I must be permitted to express the great regret I had felt on learning the decision to issue the Queen's proclamation, which at once raised the insurgents to the level of a belligerent state, and still more the language used in regard to it by her Majesty's ministers in both houses of Parliament before and since. Whatever might be the design, there could be no shadow of doubt that the effect of these events had been to encourage the friends of the disaffected here. The tone of the press and of private opinion indicated it strongly. I then alluded more especially to the brief report of the lord chancellor's speech on Thursday last, in which he had characterized the rebellious portion of my country as a belligerent state, and the war that was going on as *justum bellum*.

To this his lordship replied that he thought more stress was laid upon these events than they deserved. The fact was that a necessity seemed to exist to define the course of the government in regard to the participation of the subjects of Great Britain in the impending conflict. To that end the legal questions involved had been referred to those officers most conversant with them, and their advice had been taken in shaping the result. Their conclusion had been that, as a question merely of *fact*, a war existed. A considerable number of the States, at least seven, occu-

pying a wide extent of country, were in open resistance, whilst one or more of the others were associating themselves in the same struggle, and as yet there were no indications of any other result than a contest of arms more or less severe. In many preceding cases, much less formidable demonstrations had been recognized. Under such circumstances it seemed scarcely possible to avoid speaking of this in the technical sense as *justum bellum*, that is, a war of two sides, without in any way implying an opinion of its justice, as well as to withhold an endeavor, so far as possible, to bring the management of it within the rules of modern civilized warfare. This was all that was contemplated by the Queen's proclamation. It was designed to show the purport of existing laws, and to explain to British subjects their liabilities in case they should engage in the war. And however strongly the people of the United States might feel against their enemies, it was hardly to be supposed that in practice they would now vary from their uniformly humane policy heretofore in endeavoring to assuage and mitigate the horrors of war.

To all which I answered that under other circumstances I should be very ready to give my cheerful assent to this view of his lordship's. But I must be permitted frankly to remark that the action taken seemed, at least to my mind, a little more rapid than was absolutely called for by the occasion. It might be recollected that the new administration had scarcely had sixty days to develop its policy; that the extent to which all departments of the government had been demoralized in the preceding administration was surely understood here, at least in part; that the very organization upon which any future action was to be predicated was to be renovated and purified before a hope could be entertained of energetic and effective labor. The consequence had been that it was but just emerging from its difficulties, and beginning to develop the power of the country to cope with this rebellion, when the British government took the initiative, and decided practically that it is a struggle of two sides. And furthermore, it pronounced the insurgents to be a belligerent state before they had ever shown their capacity to maintain any kind of warfare whatever, except within one of their own harbors, and under every possible advantage. It considered them a marine power before they had ever exhibited a single privateer on the ocean. I said that I was not aware that a single armed vessel had yet been issued from any port under the control of these people. Surely this was not the case in the instance which had been relied upon in his speech by his lordship as authority for the present action. There the Greeks, however small as a people, had long been actively and effectually waging war, before the interposition of Great Britain, and, to use the language of the government, as quoted by himself, had "covered the sea with cruisers." It did seem to me therefore as if a little more time might have been taken to form a more complete estimate of the relative force of the contending parties, and of the probabilities of any long-drawn issue. And I did not doubt that the view taken by me would be that substantially taken both by the government and the people of the United States. They would inevitably infer the existence of an intention more or less marked to extend the struggle. For this reason it was that I made my present application to know whether such a design was or was not entertained; for in the alternative of an affirmative answer it was as well for us to know it, as I was bound to acknowledge in all frankness that in that contingency I had nothing further left to do in Great Britain. I said this with regret, as my own feelings had been and were of the most friendly nature.

His lordship replied by an assurance that he participated in those feelings; neither did he see the action that had been thus far taken at all in

the light in which I saw it. He believed that the United States, in their own previous history, had furnished examples of action taken quite as early as that now complained of. He instanced two cases. The first I do not now remember, for it seemed to me not important at the time; the other was the insurrection in Hungary under Kossuth, at which period, he believed, they had gone so far as actually to send an agent to that country with a view to recognition, and that to the great dissatisfaction and against the remonstrances of Austria.

I replied only to the second case, by remarking that the incidents attending that affair were not fresh in my mind, neither was I sure that I ever knew the whole action of the government; but it was my impression that the object of the mission was only confined to the acquisition of the facts necessary to form an opinion, and that, after they were obtained, no public step of any kind had been taken. Neither could I myself recollect an instance in which ample time had not been given by the United States for the development of events sufficiently decisive to justify any action that might have followed; for I begged it to be understood that the government did not mean at all to deny that there were cases in which recognition of a revolutionary government might be both expedient and proper.

The rule was clear, that whenever it became apparent that any organized form of society had advanced so far as to prove its power to defend and protect itself against the assaults of enemies, and at the same time to manifest a capacity to maintain binding relations with foreign nations, then a measure of recognition could not be justly objected to on any side.

The case was very different when such an interference should take place, prior to the establishment of the proof required, as to bring about a result which would not probably have happened but for that external agency.

And here I stop for a moment to make two remarks upon this part of the conversation. The first of these is, that I have an impression that the agent to go to Hungary, alluded to by his lordship, was Mr. Mann, the same gentleman who is now figuring in the commission of the confederates at this place. If in this I am right, we can be at no loss for his lordship's sources of information. The other remark is that the Hungarian precedent was unquestionably one in which a very strong sympathy with the insurgent party actually existed in the United States. Are we therefore to infer a similar impulse to actuate the precipitate measure now taken here?

I did not say this to his lordship, though I might have done so; but I proceeded to observe that I had come to England prepared to present the views of my government on the general question, and that I should have done so in full but for the interposition of this more immediate dispatch. At the present moment I should touch only upon one point in connexion with the acknowledgment of the insurgents even as a belligerent state. It seemed necessary to call the attention of his lordship to the fact which must be obvious to him, that as yet they had not laid any foundation for government solid enough to deserve a moment's confidence. They had undertaken to withdraw certain States from the government by an arbitrary act which they called secession, not known to the Constitution, the validity of which had at no time been acknowledged by the people of the United States, and which was now emphatically denied; but not content with this, they had gone on to substitute another system among themselves, avowedly based upon the recognition of this right of States to withdraw or secede at pleasure. With such a theory, I would ask, where could be vested the obligation of treaties with foreign powers, of the payment of any debts contracted, or, indeed, of any act performed

in good faith by the common authority for the time being established. For my own part, I fully believed that such a system could not deserve to be denominated, in any sense, a government; and therefore I could not but think any act performed here, having a tendency to invest it in the eye of the world with the notion of form and substance, could be attended only with the most complete disappointment to all the parties connected with it.

His lordship here interposed by saying that there was not, in his opinion, any occasion at present for going into this class of arguments, as the government did not contemplate taking any step that way. Should any such time arrive in the future, he should be very ready to listen to every argument that might be presented against it on the part of the United States. At this moment he thought we had better confine ourselves to the matter immediately in hand.

I then remarked that there was another subject upon which I had received a dispatch, though I should not, after so long a conference, venture to do more than open the matter to-day. This was a proposal to negotiate in regard to the rights of neutrals in time of war. The necessary powers had been transmitted to me, together with a form of a convention, which I would do myself the honor to submit to his consideration if there was any disposition to pursue the matter further. His lordship then briefly reviewed the past action of the two countries since the meeting of the congress at Paris, and expressed the willingness of Great Britain to negotiate; but he seemed to desire to leave the subject in the hands of Lord Lyons, to whom he intimated that he had already transmitted authority to assent to any modification of the only point in issue which the government of the United States might prefer. On that matter he believed there would be no difficulty whatever. Under these circumstances, I shall not press the subject further at this place until I receive new directions to that effect from the department.

His lordship then observed that there were two points upon which he should be glad himself to be enlightened, although he did not know whether I was prepared to furnish the information. They both related to the President's proclamation of a blockade. The first question was upon the nature of the blockade. The coast was very extensive, stretching along the Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico a great way. Was it the design of the United States to institute an effective blockade in its whole extent, or to make only a declaration to that effect as to the whole, and to confine the actual blockade to particular points? Considering the uniform doctrine of the government refusing to recognize the validity of mere paper blockades, he could hardly suppose they designed the latter.

To this I replied that I knew nothing directly of the President's intentions on this subject; but that inasmuch as the government had always protested against mere paper blockades, I could not suppose that it was now disposed to change its doctrine. On the contrary, I had every reason for affirming that it was the intention to make an effective blockade; and this was more practicable than at first sight might appear from the fact that there were few harbors along the coast, however great its extent, and these were not very easy of access. I thought, therefore, that even though the blockade might not be perfect, it would be sufficiently so to come within the legitimate construction of the term.

His lordship then alluded to the other point, which was, that the proclamation assigned no precise date for the commencement of the blockade, which he believed was necessary; but he presumed that that defect might be remedied at any time. To which I added that I did not

doubt any such omission of form would be supplied as soon as it was pointed out.

His lordship then made some remarks upon the adoption of the tariff; to which I replied that, in my belief, that law was mainly passed as a revenue measure, with incidental protection; that it was not in any way aimed in a hostile spirit to foreign nations; and that the people of the United States would always buy from Great Britain as much as they could pay for, and generally a good deal more. This last remark raised a smile; and thus ended his lordship's series of inquiries.

Having thus disposed of these secondary questions, I returned once more to the charge, and asked him what answer I should return to the inquiry which I had been directed to make. In order to avoid any ambiguity, I took out of my pocket your dispatch No. 4, and read to him the paragraph recapitulating the substance of Mr. Dallas's report of his interview, and the very last paragraph. I said that it was important to me that I should not make any mistake in reporting this part of the conversation; therefore I should beg him to furnish me with the precise language. He said that he did not himself know what he was to say. If it was expected of him to give any pledge of an absolute nature that his government would not at any future time, no matter what the circumstances might be, recognize an existing state in America, it was more than he could promise. If I wished an exact reply, my better way would be to address him the inquiry in writing. I said that I was well aware of that, but I had hoped that I might be saved the necessity of doing so. On reflection, he proposed to avoid that by offering to transmit to Lord Lyons directions to give such a reply to the President as, in his own opinion, might be satisfactory. To this arrangement I gave my assent, though not without some doubt whether I was doing right. In truth, if I were persuaded that her Majesty's government were really animated by a desire to favor the rebellion, I should demand a categorical answer; but thus far I see rather division of opinion, consequent upon the pressure of the commercial classes. Hence I preferred to give the short time demanded, as well as to place in the hands of the President himself the power to decide upon the sufficiency of the reply.

It may be as well to state that, both in matter and manner, the conference, which has been reported as fully and as accurately as my memory would permit, was conducted in the most friendly spirit.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 1, 1862, p. 34.]

No. 41.

Lord J. Russell to Lord Lyons.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *May 21, 1861.*

MY LORD: Mr. Adams came to me at Pembroke Lodge on the 18th instant. After some general conversation he said he was instructed to ask me for an explanation of the language I had used to Mr. Dallas.

The expressions I had employed had been interpreted in the United States as being of an unfriendly tenor, and as intimating a change of policy on the part of Great Britain. He led me to understand that any such change would put an end to his mission, and unfavorably affect the relations of the two countries.

I repeated to Mr. Adams what I had said to Mr. Dallas, that, had a separation taken place between different parts of the American Union in an amicable manner, her Majesty's government would still have regretted that a Union of States so famous and so conspicuous for its love of liberty and enlightened progress should have been dissolved; that the opposition made by the government of the United States to the secession would make us still more averse to take any step to record and recognize that secession. I explained to Mr. Adams, however, that the dispatches of Judge Black and Mr. Seward seemed to ask on our part for a perpetual pledge that we would under no circumstances recognize the seceding States. I had, therefore, thought it necessary to add that Great Britain must hold herself free to act according to the progress of events and as circumstances might require.

I reminded Mr. Adams that the United States had recognized Don Miguel, the usurper of the throne of Portugal, and had even intended to acknowledge the Hungarian republic in 1848, when it was obvious that such a republic could not endure.

I said that, on the other hand, we had taken no step except that of declaring ourselves neutral, and allowing to the southern States a belligerent character; that the size and population of the seceding States were so considerable that we could not deny them that character, but that this step implied no recognition nor allowed any other than an intermediate position on the part of the southern States.

Mr. Adams admitted this, but thought the step we had taken precipitate. He contrasted it with the long period which elapsed between the beginning of the Greek insurrection and our admission of the belligerent character of Greece.

I said that the population of the seceding States, amounting to many millions, made them of greater importance than Greece in the early days of her independence, and the critical position of our commerce made it necessary to take some step; that we could not call the seceding States rebels, nor take part in the war against them.

Mr. Adams declared he had no wish to see us take part in the war, but he did wish us not to give assistance to the South.

I told him we had no thoughts of doing so; that the sympathies of this country were rather with the North than with the South, but we wished to live on amicable terms with both parties.

I pointed out that the blockade recently instituted, and the designation applied to the privateers of the southern States as pirates, might give rise to difficulties; that, however, the blockade might no doubt be made effective, considering the small number of harbors on the southern coast, even though the extent of three thousand miles of coast were comprehended in terms of that blockade.

Mr. Adams said it was by no means the intention of the United States to institute a paper blockade, a measure against which they had always protested.

With regard to privateers and piracy, I said that although general principles might be proclaimed, the putting them into execution might be accompanied with that forbearance and humanity which might be expected from a nation so cognizant of international relations and so advanced in civilization as the United States.

I touched upon the high protective tariff recently enacted, and was assured that it was intended rather for revenue than for protection, and that if it failed in bringing revenue it would not be maintained for the sake of monopoly and restriction.

I told Mr. Adams that I did not wish at present to discuss the causes of the secession or the present state of the conflict; but I assured him that if recognition should ever be in contemplation, I would send to him and allow a full hearing to his exposition of facts and arguments.

I must not omit to state that Mr. Adams, while complaining strongly of our hasty allowance of belligerent rights to the South, expressed throughout a desire on the part of the government of the United States to live on the most friendly terms with Great Britain.

I had no hesitation in giving reciprocal assurances of good will.

I am, &c.,

J. RUSSELL.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

[Extracts.]

No. 5.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, May 22, 1861.

SIR: I have the pleasure to announce to you my arrival in this city on Saturday, May 11. On Monday, application was made through our legation for an audience with Mr. Thouvenel, minister of foreign affairs, which was granted for the 16th instant, on which day I was duly presented to him by Mr. Walsh, of the American legation.

Mr. Thouvenel, in the course of the conversation, took occasion to say that he deeply regretted the condition of things in the United States, and that in this expression of feeling he represented the views and feelings of the Emperor; that so deeply concerned was the Emperor that he had felt disposed to offer his good offices, but had been deterred from the fear that his offer might not be well received; but should occasion for this arise, he would always be ready and happy to be of use. He made special inquiry as to the policy of our government in regard to neutral rights, particularly in reference to neutral property found in southern ships. He went into considerable detail to show that historical precedents were in favor of treating southern vessels as those of a regular belligerent, and applying the same doctrine to them as had always been upheld by the United States. He dwelt particularly upon the fact that Great Britain, during our revolutionary war, had not considered our privateers as pirates. I understood him to say that, as respects an effective blockade, it would be fully recognized and respected; but he seemed much impressed with the importance of understanding clearly the intentions of our government in reference to these matters as respects the foreign world.

As respects a tender of the kind offices of the Emperor I could only thank him for the interest in our country which the suggestion manifested, but gave him no reason to suppose such offer at this time would be accepted. As to the doctrines which our government would apply in reference to the blockade of southern ports and neutral rights, I told him I had no specific instructions at present, and could only refer him to the proclamation of the President and the general principles of international law which might bear on the case. I further informed him that immediately after my reception by the Emperor I would apprise my government of the anxiety of the French government to learn the views of our

government more definitively upon these questions. You will not fail to have observed that the action of France and England upon this question of belligerent rights has been upon a mutual understanding and agreement.

Throughout the conversation he seemed anxious to impress upon me the great interest which France took in our condition, and their desire for the perpetuation of the Union of the States. He referred to the fact that France had aided in its formation, and did not desire to witness its dissolution. The recognition of the southern confederates as possessing belligerent rights he did not consider at all as recognizing them as independent States.

After the conversation had closed, to save time, I at once presented a copy of my letters of credence, and requested an audience of the Emperor, &c.

On the next day I was informed by a note from the minister that I would be received at the palace on the 19th instant, at which time I was presented in due form to the Emperor, in the presence of certain officers of the court.

* * * * *

The Emperor, after a courteous welcome, and one or two remarks of a character personally complimentary, said, in substance, that he felt great interest in the condition of things in our country; that he was very anxious our difficulties should be settled amicably; that he had been and yet was ready to offer his kind offices, if such offer would be mutually agreeable to the contending parties; that whatever tended to affect injuriously our interests was detrimental to the interests of France, and that he desired a perpetuation of the Union of the States, with some additional remarks of like tenor and character. His observations were in the same vein as those of the minister of foreign affairs, and I doubt not were the frank expressions of his views on this subject.

* * * * *

On Monday, the 20th instant, I called again on Mr. Thouvenel, in company with Mr. Sanford, (our minister to Belgium,) for the purpose of obtaining, if possible, a little more distinct information as to what France meant by the terms "neutral rights" and "belligerent" rights; how far he considered such rights as extending to the capture and condemnation of prizes in the ports of France, &c. He said in reply, in substance, that they held that the flag covers the cargo; and that if a southern ship carrying neutral property was captured, the property would not be condemned, &c. He hoped our government would recognize principles for which it had always contended. I told him it would certainly do so; but the question here was, whether there *was a flag*; that our government insisted that the confederates, being merely in rebellion, had no flag, and I could not exactly understand how a foreign government which had not recognized them as an independent power could recognize them as having a flag. He said, furthermore, that the French government had given no warning to their citizens, &c., (as the English government had,) by proclamation, because it was unnecessary; that the statute law of France (of 1825, April 10, I think) declared that any French citizen taking service under a foreign power lost all claim to protection as a citizen; that if a subject of France should take service on board of a letter of marque licensed by the Confederate States, it would be, as I understood him, piratical on the part of such subject. He said, furthermore, that no letters of marque could be fitted out in their ports, or *even sheltered* there, unless they came in from necessity, (as stress of weather, &c.,) and then could remain, I think, but twenty-four

hours; that consequently there could be no bringing of prizes into French ports, and while there a condemnation of them in the courts of the southern States. His conversation on this part of the case was very satisfactory, and he promised me a reference in writing to the French statutes bearing on the question. He added that the French government had addressed certain interrogations to our government, and would await their answer. The disposition of this government to keep on friendly relations with us is, I think, manifest, and it will not, I judge, be diminished by the obvious fact that certain portions of the public men and the press of England are felicitating themselves on the condition of things in America. The policy of having a heavy commercial power in the west, as some counterpoise to the marine power of England, is too manifest to escape a mind so sagacious as that of the present Emperor of the French. I had taken the liberty before the reception of your last dispatch, dated 4th instant, of assuring all persons, official and otherwise, with whom I came in contact, that the most effective measures were being taken by our government to crush out this causeless and wicked rebellion, and that I believed such efforts would be continued to the end; that the fears (which existed in some quarters) that the government would again temporize, and lose the advantage which the present determined enthusiasm of the people gave to it, were groundless. I find very strong feelings existing here in behalf of the Union among the American citizens from the northern States, and a determination to support the government with men and money.

No formal notice of the blockade of southern ports has been given to the government here, unless through the agency of the French minister at Washington. Indeed, I think I understood Mr. Thouvenel to say that they had received no such formal notice at all. I shall call the attention of Mr. Thouvenel to the original proclamation when I communicate to him (as I shall at once do) the additional proclamation (just received) of the blockade of the ports of Virginia and North Carolina.

Your very obedient servant,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

[Extract.]

No. 10.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 30, 1861.

SIR: Mr. Sanford, who was requested by me to look to our interests in Paris in the interval which might elapse between the withdrawal of Mr. Faulkner and your own arrival, has transmitted to me (in his dispatch No 2) an account of a very interesting conversation which he has recently held with Mr. Thouvenel on our internal affairs.

In that conversation Mr. Thouvenel intimated that, in view of the great commercial interests which are involved in the domestic controversy which is now agitating the United States, the French government had felt itself constrained to take measures, in conjunction with the government of Great Britain, to meet a condition of things which

imperiled those interests. That it had been decided that communications of a similar tenor should be addressed by both of those governments to the government of the United States, and that those communications would be forwarded in the current week. Mr. Thouvenel kindly foreshadowed the points of those communications.

As those papers may be expected to arrive by, perhaps the next steamer, I shall reserve comments upon the propositions indicated until they shall thus be fully and directly brought to the attention of the President.

There are, however, some points in the conversation, or suggested by it, which I cannot properly suffer to pass unnoticed.

First, I desire that Mr. Thouvenel may be informed that this government cannot but regard any communications held by the French government, even though unofficial, with the agents of the insurrectionary movement in this country, as exceptionable and injurious to the dignity and honor of the United States. They protest against this intercourse, however, not so much on that ground as on another. They desire to maintain the most cordial relations with the government of France, and would therefore, if possible, refrain from complaint. But it is manifest that even an unofficial reception of the emissaries of disunion has a certain though measured tendency to give them a prestige which would encourage their efforts to prosecute a civil war destructive to the prosperity of this country and aimed at the overthrow of the government itself. It is earnestly hoped that this protest may be sufficient to relieve this government from the necessity of any action on the unpleasant subject to which it relates.

Secondly. The United States cannot for a moment allow the French government to rest under the delusive belief that they will be content to have the Confederate States recognized as a belligerent power by states with which this nation is in amity. No concert of action among foreign states so recognizing the insurgents can reconcile the United States to such a proceeding, whatever may be the consequences of resistance.

Thirdly. The President turns away from these points of apprehended difference of opinion between the two governments to notice other and more agreeable subjects.

* * * * *

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 8.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, May 30, 1861.

SIR :

* * * * *

I am happy to say that there is no disposition manifested here, so far as I have observed, to favor the rebellion in our southern States, or to recognize them as an independent power. All recognition of rights on their part is for commercial purposes only. But the government of France cannot, it says, look at this rebellion as a small matter. That, embracing as it does a large section and many States, they cannot apply to it the same reasoning as if it were an unimportant matter or confined to a small locality.

Mr. Thouvenel says he has had no application from southern commissioners for any purpose of recognition, and he does not know even that such persons are or have been in Paris.

With high consideration, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM. L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 14.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, June 3, 1861.

SIR: Your dispatch of May 17, (No. 1) has been received.

Your speech at Liverpool was equally prudent and happy. Your promptness in passing through the town to the seat of government, although to be regretted in some respects, is, in view of the circumstances, approved.

Every instruction you have received from this department is full of evidence of the fact that the principal danger in the present insurrection which the President has apprehended is that of foreign intervention, aid, or sympathy; and especially of such intervention, aid, or sympathy on the part of the government of Great Britain.

The justice of this apprehension has been vindicated by the following facts, namely:

1. A guarded reserve on the part of the British secretary of state, when Mr. Dallas presented to him our protest against the recognition of the insurgents, which seemed to imply that, in some conditions, not explained to us, such a recognition might be made.

2. The contracting of an engagement by the government of Great Britain with that of France, without consulting us, to the effect that both governments should adopt one and the same course of procedure in regard to the insurrection.

3. Lord John Russell's announcement to Mr. Dallas that he was not unwilling to receive the so-called commissioners of the insurgents unofficially.

4. The issue of the Queen's proclamation, remarkable, first, for the circumstances under which it was made, namely, on the very day of your arrival in London, which had been anticipated so far as to provide for your reception by the British secretary, but without affording you the interview promised before any decisive action should be adopted; secondly, the tenor of the proclamation itself, which seems to recognize, in a vague manner, indeed, but still does seem to recognize, the insurgents as a *belligerent national power*.

That proclamation, unmodified and unexplained, would leave us no alternative but to regard the government of Great Britain as questioning our free exercise of all the rights of self-defense guaranteed to us by our Constitution and the laws of nature and of nations to suppress the insurrection.

I should have proceeded at once to direct you to communicate to the British government the definitive views of the President on this grave subject, if there were not especial reasons for some little delay.

These reasons are, first, Mr. Thouvenel has informed our representative at Paris that the two governments of Great Britain and France

were preparing, and would, without delay, address communications to this government concerning the attitude to be assumed by them in regard to the insurrection. These communications are hourly expected.

Second. You have already asked, and, it is presumed, will have obtained, an interview with the British secretary, and will have been able to present the general views of this government, and to learn definitely the purposes of Great Britain in the matter, after it shall have learned how unsatisfactory the action of the British government hitherto has been to the government of the United States.

The President is solicitous to show his high appreciation of every demonstration of consideration for the United States which the British government feels itself at liberty to make. He instructs me, therefore, to say that the prompt and cordial manner in which you were received, under peculiar circumstances, arising out of domestic afflictions which had befallen her Majesty and the secretary of state for foreign affairs, is very gratifying to this government.

A year ago the differences which had partially estranged the British and the American people from each other seemed to have been removed forever. It is painful to reflect that that ancient alienation has risen up again under circumstances which portend great social evils, if not disaster, to both countries.

Referring to your precedent instructions, and reserving further directions until we shall have your own report of the attitude of the British government as defined by itself for our consideration,

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 15.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

Washington, June 8, 1861.

SIR: I have the pleasure of acknowledging the receipt of your dispatch of May 21, (No. 2,) which contains a report of the conversation which you had held with Lord John Russell on the 18th day of that month.

This government insists, as all the world might have known that it must and would, under all circumstances, insist, on the integrity of the Union, as the chief element of national life. Since, after trials of every form of forbearance and conciliation, it has been rendered certain and apparent that this paramount and vital object can be saved only by our acceptance of civil war as an indispensable condition, that condition, with all its hazards and deplorable evils, has not been declined. The acceptance, however, is attended with a strong desire and fixed purpose that the war shall be as short and accompanied by as little suffering as possible. Foreign intervention, aid, or sympathy in favor of the insurgents, especially on the part of Great Britain, manifestly could only protract and aggravate the war. Accordingly, Mr. Dallas, under instructions from the President, in an interview conceded to him by the British secretary of state for foreign affairs, presented our protest against any such intervention.

Lord John Russell answered with earnestness that there was not in the British government the least desire to grasp at any advantages which might be supposed to arise from the unpleasant domestic differences in the United States, but, on the contrary, that they would be highly grati-

fied if those differences were adjusted, and the Union restored to its former unbroken position.

Mr. Dallas then, as he reported to us, endeavored to impress upon his lordship how important it must be that Great Britain and France should abstain, at least for a considerable time, from doing what, by encouraging groundless hopes, (of the insurgents,) would widen a breach still thought capable of being closed; but his lordship seemed to think that the matter was not ripe for decision, one way or another, and remarked that what he had already said was all that at present it was in his power to say.

Upon this report you were instructed to inform her Britannic Majesty's government that the President regarded the reply made by his lordship to Mr. Dallas's suggestion as possibly indicating a policy which this government would be obliged to deem injurious to its rights, and derogating from its dignity. This government thought the reply of the secretary unjustifiably abrupt and reserved. That abruptness and reserve unexplained, left us under a seeming necessity of inferring that the British government might be contemplating a policy of encouragement to the insurgents which would widen the breach here which we believed it possible to heal if such encouragement should not be extended. A vital interest obliged the United States to seek explanation, or to act on the inference it thus felt itself obliged to adopt.

Your dispatch of the 21st of May, (No. 2,) which has just been received, shows how you have acquitted yourself of the duty imposed upon you. After stating our complaint to his lordship, you very properly asked an elucidation of his meaning in the reply to which exception had been taken by us, and very rightly, as we think, asked whether it was the intention of her Majesty's ministers to adopt a policy which would have the effect to widen, if not to make irreparable, a breach which we believe yet to be entirely manageable by ourselves. His lordship disclaimed any such intention. A friendly argument, however, then arose between the secretary and yourself concerning what should be the form of the answer to us which his lordship could properly give, and which would, at the same time, be satisfactory to this government. The question was finally solved in the most generous manner by the proposition of his lordship that he would instruct Lord Lyons to give such a reply to the President as might, in his own opinion, be satisfactory, which proposition you accepted.

I hasten to say, by direction of the President, that your course in this proceeding is fully approved. This government has no disposition to lift questions of even national pride or sensibility up to the level of diplomatic controversy, because it earnestly and ardently desires to maintain peace, harmony, and cordial friendship with Great Britain. Lord John Russell's proposition, by authorizing the President to put the most favorable construction possible upon the response which was deemed exceptionable, removes the whole difficulty without waiting for the intervention of Lord Lyons. You will announce this conclusion to Lord John Russell, and inform him that the settlement of the affair in so friendly a spirit affords this government sincere satisfaction.

Your conversation with the British secretary incidentally brought into debate the Queen's late proclamation, (which seems to us designed to raise the insurgents to the level of a belligerent state;) the language employed by her Majesty's ministers in both houses of Parliament, the tone of the public press, and of private opinion, and especially a speech of the lord chancellor, in which he had characterized the insurgents as a belligerent state, and the civil war which they are waging against the United States as *justum bellum*.

The opinions which you expressed on these matters, and their obvious

tendency to encourage the insurrection and to protract and aggravate the civil war, are just, and meet our approbation. At the same time, it is the purpose of this government, if possible, consistently with the national welfare and honor, to have no serious controversy with Great Britain at all; and if this shall ultimately prove impossible, then to have both the defensive position and the clear right on our side. With this view, this government, as you are made aware by my dispatch No. 10, has determined to pass over without official complaint the publications of the British press, manifestations of adverse individual opinion in social life, and the speeches of British statesmen, and even those of her Majesty's ministers in Parliament, so long as they are not authoritatively adopted by her Majesty's government. We honor and respect the freedom of debate, and the freedom of the press. We indulge no apprehensions of danger to our rights and interests from any discussion to which they may be subjected, in either form, in any place. Sure as we are that the transaction now going on in our country involves the progress of civilization and humanity, and equally sure that our attitude in it is right, and no less sure that our press and our statesmen are equal in ability and influence to any in Europe, we shall have no cause to grieve if Great Britain shall leave to us the defense of the independence of nations and the rights of human nature.

My dispatch No. 14 presented four distinct grounds on which this government apprehended a policy on the part of her Majesty's government to intervene in favor of the insurgents, or to lend them aid and sympathy. The first ground was the reserve practiced by the British secretary for foreign affairs in his conversation with Mr. Dallas, referred to in the earlier part of this dispatch. I have already stated that the explanations made and offered by Lord John Russell have altogether removed this ground from debate.

The second was the contracting of an engagement by the government of Great Britain with that of France, without consulting us, to the effect that both governments would adopt one and the same course of proceeding in regard to the subject of intervention in our domestic affairs. You were informed in my dispatch No. 10 that, as this proceeding did not necessarily imply hostile feelings towards the United States, we should not formally complain of it, but should rest content with a resolution to hold intercourse only with each of those states severally, giving due notice to both that the circumstance that a concert between the two powers in any proposition each might offer to us would not modify in the least degree the action of the United States upon it.

The third ground was Lord John Russell's announcement to Mr. Dallas that he was not unwilling to receive the so-called commissioners of the insurgents unofficially. On this point you already have instructions, to which nothing need now be added.

The fourth ground is the Queen's proclamation, exceptionable first for the circumstances under which it was issued, and secondly, for the matter of that important state paper.

My dispatch No. 14 apprised you of our reason for expecting a direct communication on this subject from her Majesty's government. I reserve instructions on this fourth ground, as I did in that dispatch, expecting to discuss it fully when the promised direct communication shall bring it authoritatively before this government in the form chosen by the British government itself.

My silence on the subject of the defense of that proclamation made by Lord John Russell in his conversation with you being grounded on that motive for delay, it is hardly necessary to say that we are not to be regarded

as conceding any positions which his lordship assumed, and which you so ably contested on the occasion referred to in your dispatch. Your argument on that point is approved by the President.

The British government having committed the subject of the proposed modifications of international law on the subject of the right of neutrals in maritime war to Lord Lyons before you were prepared by our instructions to present the subject to that government, no objection is now seen to the discussion of that matter here. No communication on any subject herein discussed has yet been received from Lord Lyons. Dispatches which you must have received before this time will have enabled you to give entire satisfaction to his lordship concerning the blockade. We claim to have a right to close the ports which have been seized by insurrectionists, for the purpose of suppressing the attempted revolution, and no one could justly complain if we had done so decisively and peremptorily. In resorting to the milder and very lenient form of the blockade, we have been governed by a desire to avoid imposing hardships unnecessarily onerous upon foreign as well as domestic commerce. The President's proclamation was a notice of the intention to blockade, and it was provided that ample warning should be given to vessels approaching and vessels seeking to leave the blockaded ports before capture should be allowed. The blockade from the time it takes effect is everywhere rendered actual and effective.

Your remarks on the subject of the late tariff law were judicious. The subject of revenue policy in the altered condition of affairs is not unlikely to receive the attention of Congress.

We are gratified by the information you have given us of the friendly spirit which has thus far marked the deportment and conversation of the British government in your official intercourse with it.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 16.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 8, 1861.

SIR: I inclose a copy of a note of this date addressed to Lord Lyons, which will dispel any uncertainty which the British government may entertain in regard to our recognition of a rule of international law which they may deem important.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Lord Lyons.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 8, 1861.

MY LORD: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your note of the 5th instant, with the accompanying papers, relative to a claim in the case of the cargo of the bark Winifred, a part of which is represented to belong to British subjects.

In reply, I regret that at this juncture I do not feel at liberty to interfere in the case, as it is understood that the usual proceedings in the prize court at New York have been set on foot against the vessel and her cargo.

If, however, that court shall be satisfied of the ownership by British subjects of the part of the cargo claimed, it cannot be doubted that restitution will be decreed, as this government recognizes the right of the property of a friendly nation in the vessels of an insurgent to be exempted from condemnation.

The papers which accompanied your note are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, your lordship's most obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

Right Honorable Lord LYONS, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extracts.]

No. 8.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, June 14, 1861.

SIR:

The intelligence of the feeling expressed in America upon the reception of the Queen's proclamation was fully expected by me, so that it excited no surprise, and much of the course of argument in your dispatch will be found to have been already adopted in my conference with Lord John Russell, an account of which is before this time in your hands.

I applied for an interview with Lord John Russell, and he appointed one for ten o'clock on Wednesday, the 12th, at his own house.

I next approached the most delicate portion of my task. I descanted upon the irritation produced in America by the Queen's proclamation, upon the construction almost universally given to it, as designed to aid the insurgents by raising them to the rank of a belligerent state, and upon the very decided tone taken by the President in my dispatches in case any such design was really entertained. I added that from my own observation of what had since occurred here, I had not been able to convince myself of the existence of such a design. But it was not to be disguised that the fact of the continued stay of the pseudo commissioners in this city, and still more the knowledge that they had been admitted to more or less interviews with his lordship, was calculated to excite uneasiness. Indeed, it had already given great dissatisfaction to my government. I added, as moderately as I could, that in all frankness any further protraction of this relation could scarcely fail to be viewed by us as hostile in spirit, and to require some corresponding action accordingly.

His lordship then reviewed the course of Great Britain. He explained the mode in which they had consulted with France, prior to any action at all, as to the reception of the deputation from the so-called Confederate States. It had been the custom both in France and here to receive such persons unofficially for a long time back. Poles, Hungarians, Italians, &c., &c., had been allowed interviews, to hear what they had to say. But

this did not imply recognition in their case any more than in ours. He added that he had seen the gentlemen once some time ago, and once more a short time since; and he had no expectation of seeing them any more.

* * * * *

I shall continue my relations here until I discover some action apparently in conflict with it, or receive specific orders from the department dictating an opposite course.

I ventured to repeat my regret that the proclamation had been so hastily issued, and adverted to the fact that it seemed contrary to the agreement said to have been proposed by Mr. Dallas and concurred in by his lordship, to postpone all action until I should arrive, possessed with all the views of the new administration. But still, though I felt that much mischief had ensued in the creation of prejudices in the United States, not now easy to be eradicated, I was not myself disposed in any part of my conduct to aggravate the evil. My views had been much modified by opportunities of more extended conversation with persons of weight in Great Britain, by the improved tone of the press, by subsequent explanations in Parliament, by the prohibition of all attempts to introduce prizes into British ports, and, lastly, by the unequivocal expression of sentiment in the case of Mr. Gregory when the time came for him to press his motion of recognition. I trusted that nothing new might occur to change the current again, for nothing was so unfortunate as the effect of a recurrence of reciprocal irritations, however trifling, between countries, in breaking up the good understanding which it was always desirable to preserve.

His lordship agreed to this, but remarked that he could not but think the complaint of the proclamation, though natural enough perhaps at this moment, was really ill founded. He went over the ground once more which he occupied in the former interview—the necessity of doing something to relieve the officers of their ships from the responsibility of treating these persons as pirates if they met them on the seas. For his part, he could not believe the United States would persevere in the idea of hanging them, for it was not in consonance with their well-known character. But what would be their own situation if they should be found practicing upon a harsher system than the Americans themselves.

Here was a very large territory—a number of States—and people counted by millions, who were in a state of actual war. The fact was undeniable and the embarrassment unavoidable. Under such circumstances the law officers of the Crown advised the policy which had been adopted. It was designed only as a preventive to immediate evils. The United States should not have thought hard of it. They meant to be entirely neutral.

I replied that we asked no more than that. We desired no assistance. Our objection to this act was that it was practically not an act of neutrality. It had depressed the spirits of the friends of the government. It had raised the courage of the insurgents. We construed it as adverse, because we could not see the necessity of such immediate haste. These people were not a navigating people. They had not a ship on the ocean. They had made no prizes, so far as I knew, excepting such as they had caught by surprises. Even now, I could not learn that they had fitted out anything more than a few old steamboats, utterly unable to make any cruise on the ocean, and scarcely strong enough to bear a cannon of any caliber. But it was useless to go over this any more. The thing was now done. All that we could hope was that the later explanations would counteract the worst effects that we had reason to apprehend from it; and, at any

rate, there was one compensation—the act had released the government of the United States from responsibility for any misdeeds of the rebels toward Great Britain. If any of their people should capture or maltreat a British vessel on the ocean, the reclamation must be made only upon those who had authorized the wrong. The United States would not be liable.

* * * * *

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

N^o. 19.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, June 17, 1861.

SIR: Every instruction which this government has given to its representatives abroad, since the recent change of administration took place, has expressed our profound anxiety lest the disloyal citizens who are engaged in an attempt to overthrow the Union should obtain aid and assistance from foreign nations, either in the form of a recognition of their pretended sovereignty, or in some other and more qualified or guarded manner. Every instruction has expressed our full belief that, without such aid or assistance, the insurrection would speedily come to an end, while any advantage that it could derive from such aid or assistance could serve no other purpose than to protract the existing struggle and aggravate the evils it is inflicting on our own country and on foreign and friendly nations. Every instruction bears evidence of an earnest solicitude to avoid even an appearance of menace or of want of comity towards foreign powers; but at the same time it has emphatically announced, as is now seen to have been necessary, our purpose not to allow any one of them to expect to remain in friendship with us if it should, with whatever motive, practically render such aid or assistance to the insurgents. We have intended not to leave it doubtful that a concession of sovereignty to the insurgents, though it should be indirect or unofficial, or though it should be qualified so as to concede only belligerent or other partial rights, would be regarded as inconsistent with the relations due to us by friendly nations. Nor has it been left at all uncertain that we shall, in every event, insist that these United States must be considered and dealt with now, as heretofore, by such nations as exclusively sovereign for all purposes whatsoever within the territories over which the Constitution has been extended. On the other hand we have not, at any time, been unmindful of the peculiar circumstances which might excite apprehensions on the part of commercial nations for the safety of their subjects and their property in the conflicts which might occur upon sea as well as on land between the forces of the United States and those of the insurgents.

The United States have never disclaimed the employment of letters of marque as a means of maritime war. The insurgents early announced their intention to commission privateers. We knew that friendly nations would be anxious for guarantees of safety from injury by that form of depredation upon the national commerce. We knew also that such nations would desire to be informed whether their flags should be regarded as protecting goods, not contraband of war, of disloyal citizens, found

under them, and whether the goods, not contraband, of subjects of such nations would be safe from confiscation when found in vessels of disloyal citizens of the United States. This administration, free from some of the complications of those which had preceded it, promptly took up the negotiations relating to the declaration of the congress of Paris, just at the point where they had been suspended by President Buchanan. We found it just and humane in itself so far as it goes, and that it had only failed to be accepted by the United States because foreign nations had refused to accept an additional principle proposed by this government, yet more just and humane than any which it does contain, namely, that the property of private citizens, not contraband, should be exempted from confiscation in maritime war. While still willing and desirous to have that further principle incorporated in the law of nations, we nevertheless instructed you, and all our other representatives in foreign countries, to waive it, if necessary, and to stipulate, subject to the concurrence of the Senate of the United States, our adhesion to the declaration of the congress of Paris as a whole and unmodified. This was done so early as the 24th day of April last, long before the date of the instruction which Mr. Mercier proposed to submit to us. We have ever since that time been waiting for the responses of foreign powers to this high and liberal demonstration on our part. We have, however, received no decisive answers on the subject from those powers.

It was under these circumstances that on the fifteenth day of June, instant, the minister from France and the minister from Great Britain, having previously requested an interview, were received by me. Each of them announced that he was charged by his government to read a dispatch to me and to give me a copy if I should desire it.

I answered that, owing to the peculiar circumstances of the times, I could not consent to an official reading or delivery of these papers without first knowing their characters and objects. They confidentially and with entire frankness put the dispatches into my hands for an informal preliminary examination. Having thus become possessed of their characters, I replied to those ministers that I could not allow them to be officially communicated to this government. They will doubtless mention this answer to their respective states.

I give you now the reasons of this government for pursuing this course in regard to the dispatch from France, that you may communicate them to the French government, if you shall find it necessary or expedient.

Some time ago we learned through our legation at St. Petersburg that an understanding had been effected between the two governments of Great Britain and France that they should take one and the same course on the subject of the political disturbances in this country, including the possible recognition of the insurgents. At a later period this understanding was distinctly avowed by Mr. Thouvenel to Mr. Sanford, who had been informally introduced by me to the French minister for foreign affairs, and by Lord John Russell to Mr. Dallas, our late minister in London. The avowal in each case preceded the arrival of our newly appointed ministers in Europe, with their instructions for the discharge of their respective missions.

On receiving their avowals I immediately instructed yourself and Mr. Adams "that although we might have expected a different course on the part of these two great powers, yet, as the fact that an understanding existed between them did not certainly imply an unfriendly spirit, we should not complain of it, but that it must be understood by the French and British governments that we shall deal hereafter, as heretofore, in this case, as in all others, with each power separately, and that the

agreement for concerted action between them would not at all influence the course we should pursue." The concert thus avowed has been carried out. The ministers came to me together; the instructions they proposed to me differ in form, but are counterparts in effect.

Adhering to our previous decision, which before this time has doubtlessly been made known to the government of France, we do not make this concert, under the circumstances, a reason for declining to hear the instruction with which Mr. Mercier is charged.

That paper does not expressly deny the sovereignty of the United States of America, but it does assume, inconsistently with that sovereignty, that the United States are not altogether and for all purposes one sovereign power, but that this nation consists of two parties, of which this government is one. France proposes to take cognizance of both parties as belligerents, and for some purposes to hold communication with each. The instruction would advise us indeed that we must not be surprised if France shall address herself to a government which she says is to be installed at Montgomery, for certain explanations. This intimation is conclusive in determining this government not to allow the instruction to be read to it.

The United States, rightly jealous, as we think, of their sovereignty, cannot suffer themselves to debate any abridgment of that sovereignty with France or with any other nation. Much less can it consent that France shall announce to it a conclusion of her own against that sovereignty, which conclusion France has adopted without any previous conference with the United States on the subject. This government insists that the United States are one whole undivided nation, especially so far as foreign nations are concerned, and that France is, by the law of nations and by treaties, not a neutral power between two imaginary parties here, but a friend of the United States.

In the spirit of this understanding of the case, we are not only not wishing to seek or to give offense to France, but, on the contrary, we desire to preserve peace and friendship with that great power, as with all other nations. We do not feel at liberty to think, and do not think, that France intended any want of consideration towards the United States in directing that the instruction in question should be read to us. Outside of that paper we have abundant evidence of the good feeling and good wishes of the Emperor, and even his anxious solicitude for the same consummation which is the supreme object of our own desires and labors, namely, the preservation of the American Union in its full and absolute integrity.

Doubtlessly the proceeding has been the result of inadvertence. We feel ourselves at liberty to think that it would not have occurred if we had been so fortunate as to have been heard through you in the consultations of the French government. We think we can easily see how the inadvertence has occurred. France seems to have mistaken a mere casual and ephemeral insurrection here, such as is incidental in the experience of all nations, because all nations are merely human societies, such as have sometimes happened in the history of France herself, for a war which has flagrantly separated this nation into two co-existing political powers which are contending in arms against each other after the separation.

It is erroneous, so far as foreign nations are concerned, to suppose that any war exists in the United States. Certainly there cannot be two belligerent powers where there is no war. There is here, as there has always been, one political power, namely, the United States of America, competent to make war and peace, and conduct commerce and alliances with all foreign nations. There is none other, either in fact or recognized by foreign nations. There is, indeed, an armed sedition seeking to over-

throw the government, and the government is employing military and naval forces to repress it. But these facts do not constitute a war presenting two belligerent powers, and modifying the national character, rights, and responsibilities, or the characters, rights, and responsibilities of foreign nations. It is true that insurrection may ripen into revolution, and that revolution thus ripened may extinguish a previously existing state, or divide it into one or more independent states, and that if such states continue their strife after such division, then there exists a state of war affecting the characters, rights, and duties of all the parties concerned. But this only happens when the revolution has thus run its successful course.

The French government says, in the instruction which has been tendered to us, that certain facts which it assumes confer upon the insurgents of this country, in the eyes of foreign powers, all the appearances of a government *de facto*, wherefore, whatever may be its regrets, the French government must consider the two contending parties as employing the forces at their disposal in conformity with the laws of war.

This statement assumes not only that the law of nations entitles any insurrectionary faction, when it establishes a *de facto* government, to be treated as belligerent, but also that the fact of the attainment of this status is to be determined by the appearance of it in the eyes of foreign nations. If we should concede both of these positions, we should still insist that the existence of a *de facto* government, entitled to belligerent rights, is not established in the present case. We have already heard from most of the foreign nations. There are only two which seem so to construe appearances, and France is one of them. Are the judgments of these two to outweigh those of all other nations? Doubtless each nation may judge and act for itself, but it certainly cannot expect the United States to accept its decision upon a question vital to their national existence. The United States will not refuse upon the question when and how new nations are born out of existing nations. They are well aware that the rights of the States involve their duties and their destinies, and they hold those rights to be absolute as against all foreign nations. These rights do not at all depend on the appearances which their condition may assume in the eyes of foreign nations, whether strangers, neutrals, friends, or even allies. The United States will maintain and defend their sovereignty throughout the bounds of the republic, and they deem all other nations bound to respect that sovereignty until, if ever, Providence shall consent that it shall be successfully overthrown. Any system of public law or national morality that conflicts with this would resolve society, first in this hemisphere and then in the other, into anarchy and chaos.

This government is sensible of the importance of the step it takes in declining to hear the communication the tender of which has drawn out these explanations. It believes, however, that it need not disturb the good relations which have so long and so happily subsisted between the United States and France.

The paper, as understood, while implying a disposition on the part of France to accord belligerent rights to the insurgents, does not name, specify, or even indicate one such belligerent right. On the other hand, the rights which it asserts that France expects, as a neutral, from the United States, as a belligerent, are even less than this government, on the 24th of April, instructed you to concede and guarantee to her by treaty, as a friend. On that day we offered to her our adhesion to the declaration of Paris, which contains four propositions, namely: 1st. That privateering shall be abolished. 2d. That a neutral flag covers enemy's

goods not contraband of war. 3d. That goods of a neutral, not contraband, shall not be confiscated though found in an enemy's vessel. 4th. That blockades, in order to be lawful, must be maintained by competent force. We have always, when at war, conceded the three last of these rights to neutrals, *a fortiori*, we could not when at peace deny them to friendly nations. The first-named concession was proposed on the grounds already mentioned. We are still ready to guarantee these rights, by convention with France, whenever she shall authorize either you or her minister here to enter into convention. There is no reservation or difficulty about their application in the present case. We hold all the citizens of the United States, loyal or disloyal, alike included by the law of nations and treaties; and we hold ourselves bound by the same obligations to see, so far as may be in our power, that all our citizens, whether maintaining this government or engaged in overthrowing it, respect those rights in favor of France and of every other friendly nation. In any case, not only shall we allow no privateer or national vessel to violate the rights of friendly nations as I have thus described them, but we shall also employ all our naval force to prevent the insurgents from violating them just as much as we do to prevent them from violating the laws of our own country.

What, then, does France claim of us that we do not accord to her? Nothing. What do we refuse to France by declining to receive the communication sent to us through the hands of Mr. Mercier? Nothing but the privilege of telling us that we are at war, when we maintain we are at peace, and that she is a neutral, when we prefer to recognize her as a friend.

Of course, it is understood that on this occasion we reserve, as on all others, our right to suppress the insurrection by naval as well as by military power, and for that purpose to close such of our ports as have fallen or may fall into the hands of the insurgents, either directly or in the more lenient and equitable form of a blockade, which for the present we have adopted. It is thus seen that there is no practical subject of difference between the two governments. The United States will hope that France will not think it necessary to adhere to and practice upon the speculation concerning the condition of our internal affairs which she has proposed to communicate to us. But however this may be, the United States will not anticipate any occasion for a change of the relations which, with scarcely any interruption, have existed between the two nations for three-quarters of a century, and have been very instrumental in promoting, not merely the prosperity and greatness of each state, but the cause of civil and religious liberty and free institutions throughout the world.

This government understands equally the interest of friendly nations and its own in the present emergency. If they shall not interfere, the attempt at revolution here will cease without inflicting serious evils upon foreign nations. All that they can do by any interference, with a view to modify our action, will only serve to prolong the present unpleasant condition of things, and possibly to produce results that would be as universally calamitous as they would be irretrievable.

The case, as it now stands, is the simple, ordinary one that has happened at all times and in all countries. A discontented domestic faction seeks foreign intervention to overthrow the Constitution and the liberties of its own country. Such intervention, if yielded, is ultimately disastrous to the cause it is designed to aid. Every uncorrupted nation, in its deliberate moments, prefers its own integrity, even with unbearable evils, to division through the power or influence of any foreign state.

This is so in France. It is not less so in this country. Down deep in the hearts of the American people—deeper than the love of trade, or of freedom—deeper than the attachment to any local or sectional interest, or partizan pride or individual ambition—deeper than any other sentiment—is that one out of which the Constitution of this Union arose, namely, American independence—independence of all foreign control, alliance, or influence. Next above it lies the conviction that neither peace, nor safety, nor public liberty, nor prosperity, nor greatness, nor empire, can be attained here with the sacrifice of the unity of the people of North America. Those who, in a frenzy of passion, are building expectations on other principles do not know what they are doing. Whenever one part of this Union shall be found assuming bonds of independence or of fraternity towards any foreign people, to the exclusion of the sympathies of their native land; then, even if not before, that spirit will be reawakened which brought the States of this republic into existence, and which will preserve them united until the common destiny which it opened to them shall be fully and completely realized.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 21.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, June 19, 1861.

SIR: On the 15th day of June instant, Lord Lyons, the British minister, and Mr. Mercier, the French minister, residing here, had an appointed interview with me. Each of those representatives proposed to read to me an instruction which he had received from his government, and to deliver me a copy if I should desire it. I answered, that in the present state of the correspondence between their respective governments and that of the United States, I deemed it my duty to know the characters and effects of the instructions, respectively, before I could consent that they should be officially communicated to this department. The ministers thereupon, confidentially, and very frankly submitted the papers to me for preliminary inspection. After having examined them so far as to understand their purport, I declined to hear them read, or to receive official notice of them.

I proceed now to give you our reasons for this course, that you may, if you find it necessary or expedient, communicate them to the government of Great Britain.

When we received official information that an understanding was existing between the British and French governments that they would take one and the same course concerning the insurrection which has occurred in this country, involving the question of recognizing the independence of a revolutionary organization, we instructed you to inform the British government that we had expected from both of those powers a different course of proceeding. We added, however, that inasmuch as the proposed concert of action between them did not necessarily imply any unfriendliness of purpose or of disposition, we should not complain of it, but that we should insist in this case, as in all others, on dealing with each of those powers alone, and that their agreement to act together would not at all affect the course which we should pursue. Adhering to this

decision, we have not made the concert of the two powers a ground of objection to the reading of the instruction with which Lord Lyons was charged.

That paper purports to contain a decision at which the British government has arrived, to the effect that this country is divided into two belligerent parties, of which this government represents one, and that Great Britain assumes the attitude of a neutral between them.

This government could not, consistently with a just regard for the sovereignty of the United States, permit itself to debate these novel and extraordinary positions with the government of her Britannic Majesty; much less can we consent that that government shall announce to us a decision derogating from that sovereignty, at which it has arrived without previously conferring with us upon the question. The United States are still solely and exclusively sovereign within the territories they have lawfully acquired and long possessed, as they have always been. They are at peace with all the world, as, with unimportant exceptions, they have always been. They are living under the obligations of the law of nations, and of treaties with Great Britain, just the same now as heretofore; they are, of course, the friend of Great Britain, and they insist that Great Britain shall remain their friend now just as she has hitherto been. Great Britain, by virtue of these relations, is a stranger to parties and sections in this country, whether they are loyal to the United States or not, and Great Britain can neither rightfully qualify the sovereignty of the United States, nor concede, nor recognize any rights, or interests, or power of any party, state, or section, in contravention to the unbroken sovereignty of the federal Union. What is now seen in this country is the occurrence, by no means peculiar, but frequent in all countries, more frequent even in Great Britain than here, of an armed insurrection engaged in attempting to overthrow the regularly constituted and established government. There is, of course, the employment of force by the government to suppress the insurrection, as every other government necessarily employs force in such cases. But these incidents by no means constitute a state of war impairing the sovereignty of the government, creating belligerent sections, and entitling foreign states to intervene or to act as neutrals between them, or in any other way to cast off their lawful obligations to the nation thus for the moment disturbed. Any other principle than this would be to resolve government everywhere into a thing of accident and caprice, and ultimately all human society into a state of perpetual war.

We do not go into any argument of fact or of law in support of the positions we have thus assumed. They are simply the suggestions of the instinct of self-defense, the primary law of human action, not more the law of individual than of national life.

This government is sensible of the importance of the step it takes in declining to receive the communication in question. It hopes and believes, however, that it need not disturb the good relations which have hitherto subsisted between the two countries which, more than any other nations, have need to live together in harmony and friendship.

We believe that Great Britain has acted inadvertently, and under the influence of apprehensions of danger to her commerce, which either are exaggerated or call for fidelity on her part to her habitual relations to the United States, instead of a hasty attempt to change those relations.

Certainly this government has exerted itself to the utmost to prevent Great Britain from falling into the error of supposing that the United States could consent to any abatement of their sovereignty in the present emergency. It is, we take leave to think, the common misfortune of the

two countries that Great Britain was not content to wait before dispatching the instruction in question, until you had been received by her Majesty's government, and had submitted the entirely just, friendly, and liberal overtures with which you were charged.

Although the paper implies, without affirming; that the insurgents of this country possess some belligerent rights, it does not name, specify, or indicate one such right. It confines itself to stating what the British government require or expect the United States to do. Virtually, it asks us to concede to Great Britain the principles laid down in the declaration of the congress held at Paris in 1856. It asks indeed a little less, certainly nothing more or different from this. The British government ask this of us to-day, the 15th of June, in ignorance of the fact that we had, so early as the 25th of April, instructed you to tender, without reservation, to Great Britain our accession, pure and simple, to that declaration. We have all the while, since that instruction was sent forth, been ready, as we now are ready, to accede to the declaration, where and whenever Great Britain may be ready and willing to receive it. The argument contained in the instruction seems, therefore, to have been as unnecessary and irrelevant as it is unacceptable. Lord Lyons thinks that his instructions do not authorize him to enter into convention with us here. You will inform the government of Great Britain of the fact, and, if they prefer, you will enter into the convention at London.

Of course it is understood that the concessions herein made do not affect or impair the right of the United States to suppress the insurrection as well by maritime as by land operations, and for this purpose to exclude all commerce from such of the ports as may have fallen into the hands of the insurgents, either by closing the ports directly or by the more lenient means of a blockade, which we have already adopted.

It is thus seen that, in the present case, there is only an embarrassment resulting from the similar designs of the two governments to reach one common object by different courses without knowledge of each other's dispositions in that respect. There is nothing more. We propose, as a nation at peace, to give to Great Britain as a friend what she as a neutral demands of us, a nation at war. We rejoice that it happens so. We are anxious to avoid all causes of misunderstanding with Great Britain; to draw closer, instead of breaking, the existing bonds of amity and friendship. There is nothing good or great which both nations may not expect to attain or effect if they may remain friends. It would be a hazardous day for both the branches of the British race when they should determine to try how much harm each could do the other.

We do not forget that, although thus happily avoiding misunderstanding on the present occasion, Great Britain may in some way hereafter do us wrong or injury by adhering to the speculative views of the rights and duties of the two governments which she has proposed to express. But we believe her to be sincere in the good wishes for our welfare, which she has so constantly avowed, and we will not, therefore, suffer ourselves to anticipate occasions for difference which, now that both nations fully understand each other, may be averted or avoided.

One point remains. The British government, while declining, out of regard to our natural sensibility, to propose mediation for the settlement of the differences which now unhappily disturb the American people, have nevertheless expressed, in a very proper manner, their willingness to undertake the kindly duty of mediation if we should desire it.

The President expects you to say on this point, to the British government, that we appreciate this generous and friendly demonstration; but that we cannot solicit or accept mediation from any, even the most

friendly, quarter. The conditions of society here, the character of our government, the exigencies of the country, forbid that any dispute arising among us should ever be referred to foreign arbitration. We are a republican and American people. The Constitution of our government furnishes all needful means for the correction or removal of any possible political evil. Adhering strictly as we do to its directions, we shall surmount all our present complications, and preserve the government complete, perfect, and sound, for the benefit of future generations.

But the integrity of any nation is lost, and its fate becomes doubtful, whenever strange hands, and instruments unknown to the Constitution, are employed to perform the proper functions of the people, established by the organic laws of the State.

Hoping to have no occasion hereafter to speak for the hearing of friendly nations upon the topics which I have now discussed, I add a single remark by way of satisfying the British government that it will do wisely by leaving us to manage and settle this domestic controversy in our own way.

The fountains of discontent in any society are many, and some lie much deeper than others. Thus far this unhappy controversy has disturbed only those which are nearest the surface. There are others which lie still deeper that may yet remain, as we hope, long undisturbed. If they should be reached, no one can tell how or when they could be closed. It was foreign intervention that opened, and that alone could open, similar fountains in the memorable French revolution.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

[Extracts.]

No. 11.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, June —, 1861.

SIR: Your dispatch No. 10 was received by me on the 18th instant, and its substance communicated to Mr. Thouvenel on the 19th. On that day I had with him an interesting conversation.

He said, furthermore, (what he has so often said before,) that the French government had no sympathy whatever with the seceding States of the South; that it had no idea of recognizing them as an independent power; that should they, in the course of time, obtain a status as an independent power among nations, and show themselves able to maintain that position, the French government might ultimately recognize them; but this would be after the expiration of a time ample to test their ability in this behalf. He said, incidentally, three or four years, though I do not suppose he intended anything by this, except to explain more fully his meaning.

He said, furthermore, he had received Mr. Rost, (one of the commissioners of the South,) who applied to him through a third party; that he had not applied to be received as a *commissioner* from the South; if he had so done he would not have received him. That he had been received by Lord John Russell, and he (Mr. Thouvenel) could not "turn him out of doors." Besides, he said, he had received him because he felt it

a duty to get all the information he could, and obtain knowledge of facts in reference to matters of so much importance, from all possible sources; that for this purpose he had received all sorts of people; that on the same day he had received envoys from Garibaldi and the King of Naples. Besides this, he wished, he said, to inform Mr. Rost of the inutility of now seeking from the French government a recognition of the independence of the southern confederates. He said, furthermore, that he had communicated these matters to Mr. Mercier at Washington, to be communicated to you. In reply, I said to him that, although our government protested and would protest against all intercourse, official and otherwise, with these commissioners, as prejudicial and injurious to us, yet I did not know (aside from the mere act of conference) that we could have a just cause of complaint of an interview with such a result as that above referred to. I told him, furthermore, that our government did not mean to deny that principle of international law which authorizes the recognition of a *de facto* government when its status has become fixed and its power to sustain itself satisfactorily shown.

I think I may say, with some confidence, that all the efforts of the agents of the confederates on this side of the channel have thus far been abortive. They have no encouragement to their hopes of recognition. They have met with no success in their attempts to negotiate a loan.

With much respect, I have the honor to be your obedient servant,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 21, 1861.

DEAR SIR: I am obliged to you for your private note. I am unable to recall the particular occasion on which Lord Lyons may have thought my language or manner intentionally offensive. Certainly I have been unconscious of expressing or manifesting any disrespect towards him personally. At the same time I have not intended to leave Lord Lyons at liberty to believe that the conduct of his government was any more satisfactory than my official correspondence with you has shown it to be. On the other hand, it will perhaps do no harm for you to explain privately to Lord Palmerston and to Lord Clarendon that I think I have practiced much caution in refraining at all times from expressing to Lord Lyons frankly the dissatisfaction which has been produced by every word that has thus far been expressed to us, or about us, by his government, with the exception of Lord John Russell's conversation with you, in which you discussed with him his abrupt and unsatisfactory reply to Mr. Dallas.

If British statesmen really desire that things may go smoothly between the British government and ours, they must look deeper than into the mere manner of conducting diplomatic intercourse. The whole American people, so far as they are American, are shocked, offended, and disgusted with declarations of neutrality by the British government, by its arrangements with the French government to deny the sovereignty of the United States, and its countenance of the insurrection. You, and

I, and Lord Lyons, and Lord Clarendon, and Lord Palmerston will die and perhaps all of us be forgotten before the respect and affection cherished in this country towards England will have recovered the tone they had when the Prince of Wales returned nine months ago from our shores to his own.

The Emperor of France, the Emperor of Russia, the Emperor of Austria, the King of Prussia, and the King of Belgium, every one of them has expressed to us his sympathy with us for the *integrity of the American republic*. Their ministers do the same, frankly and earnestly. Neither Queen, ministers, nor statesmen of Great Britain has said or intimated *so much*. I wish to think well of England, and I wish her well. But she shall not demoralize me, nor shall I demoralize my country. I prefer, moreover, to avow present discontent rather than to cherish revenge. All Americans may not be like me in this.

Just now I have saved Lord Lyons from the correspondence, I think much to his satisfaction, and I believe we are generally getting along quite well.

I am, dear sir, very truly, yours always,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 1, 1862, p. 42.]

No. 50.

Lord J. Russell to Lord Lyons.

[Extract.]

FOREIGN OFFICE, June 21, 1861.

I have to state to your lordship that I have every reason¹ to be satisfied with the language and conduct of Mr. Adams since he has arrived in this country.

The only complaint which he has urged here is, that the Queen's proclamation announcing her neutrality was hasty and premature.

I said, in the first place, that our position was of necessity one of neutrality; that we could not take part either for the North against the South, or for the South against the North.

To this he willingly assented, and said that the United States expected no assistance from us to enable their government to finish the war.

I rejoined that if such was the case, as I supposed, it would not have been right either towards our admirals and naval commanders, nor towards our merchants and mercantile marine, to leave them without positive and public orders; that the exercise of belligerent rights of search and capture by a band of adventurers clustered in some small island in the Greek Archipelago or in the Atlantic would subject them to the penalties of piracy; but we could not treat 5,000,000 of men who had declared their independence like a band of marauders or filibusters. If we had done so, we should have done more than the United States themselves. Their troops had taken prisoners many of the adherents of the confederacy, but I could not perceive from the newspapers that in any case they had brought these prisoners to trial for high treason, or shot them as rebels. Had we hung the captain of an armed vessel of the southern confederacy as a pirate, we should have done that which a sense of humanity had prohibited on the part of the government itself

whose authority was set at defiance. We surely could not be expected to go beyond the United States government themselves in measures of severity.

I had quoted in the House of Commons the case of the Turks and Greeks in order to avail myself of the sound maxim of policy enunciated by Mr. Canning, that the question of belligerent rights is one, not of principle, but of fact; that the size and strength of the party contending against a government, and not the goodness of their cause, entitle them to the character and treatment of belligerents.

I added that the case quoted by me had been objected to, as if I had compared the United States to Turkey, and the southern confederacy to Greeks.

As well might it be said, if any one were to cite the case of Mr. Wilkes in an argument on general warrants, that the case was not applicable because the character of Mr. Wilkes was not entitled to our sympathy or respect.

Mr. Adams maintained that, practically, the so-called Confederate States had no ships of war at sea, and therefore the royal proclamation was unnecessary.

The United States minister at Paris has made propositions to the imperial government founded on the answer of Mr. Marcy to the request formerly made to him to adopt, on the part of his government, the declaration of Paris.

The government of the Emperor entirely concur with her Majesty's government in the opinion that these propositions ought to be rejected.

When I asked Mr. Adams whether he had similar propositions to make to her Majesty's government, he informed me that he had no instructions to do so.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

[Extracts.]

No. 22.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, June 22, 1861.

SIR: * * * * *

We wish to act singly and in good faith with the French government. We understand, and shall continue to understand, that France does not concede belligerent rights to the insurgents in contravention of our sovereignty. We shall insist that she does nothing adverse to our position, whatever may be said to the contrary.

She has proposed to tell us that she thinks the Confederate States are entitled to belligerent rights. We have declined to hear that. We have not heard it. We shall continue to regard France as respecting our government, throughout the whole country, until she *practically acts in violation of her friendly obligations* to us, as we understand them. When she does that, it will be time enough to inquire whether, if we accede to the treaty of Paris, she could, after that, allow pirates upon our commerce shelter in her ports, and what our remedy then should be. We have no fear on this head.

* * * * *

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 10.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, June 28, 1861.

SIR:

My interview with his lordship was intended only to express to him the views entertained by the President, as communicated to me in your dispatches No. 14 and No. 15 of the reports made by me of our first conference. His lordship said that he had just received dispatches as late as the 15th, communicating the same information, and that Lord Lyons had learned, through another member of the diplomatic corps, that no further expression of opinion on the subject in question would be necessary. This led to the most frank and pleasant conversation which I have yet had with his lordship, in which we reviewed the various points of difficulty that had arisen in a manner too desultory to admit of reporting, excepting in the general result.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extracts.]

No. 32.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 1, 1861.

SIR: Your dispatch No. 8 (dated June 14) has been received.

I conclude with the remark that the British government can never expect to induce the United States to acquiesce in her assumed position of this government as divided in any degree into two powers for war more than for peace. At the same time, if her Majesty's government shall continue to practice absolute forbearance from any interference in our domestic affairs, we shall not be captious enough to inquire what name it gives to that forbearance, or in what character it presents itself before the British nation in doing so. We hold ourselves entitled to regard the forbearance as an act of a friendly power, acting unconsciously of a domestic disturbance among us, of which friendly states can take no cognizance. On this point our views are not likely to undergo any change. In maintaining this position we are sure we do nothing derogating from the dignity of the British government, while we inflexibly maintain and preserve the just rights and the honor of the United States.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

[Extract.]

No. 27.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 6, 1861.

SIR:

It is almost unnecessary to say that what we proposed to France was equally and simultaneously proposed to every other maritime power. In this way we expected to remove every cause that any foreign power could have for the recognition of the insurgents as a belligerent power.

The matter stood in this plain and intelligible way until certain declarations or expressions of the French government induced you to believe that they would recognize and treat the insurgents as a distinct national power for belligerent purposes. It was not altogether unreasonable that you, being at Paris, should suppose that this government would think itself obliged to acquiesce in such a course by the government of France. So assuming, you thought that we would not adhere to our proposition to accede to the declaration, pure and simple, since such a course would, as you thought, be effective to bind this government without binding the insurgents, and would leave France at liberty to hold us bound, and the insurgents free from the obligations created by our adhesion. Moreover, if we correctly understand your dispatch on that subject, you supposed that you might propose our adhesion to the treaty of Paris, not pure and simple, but with the addition of the Marcy proposition in the first instance, and might afterwards, in case of its being declined in that form, withdraw the addition, and then propose our accession to the declaration of Paris, pure and simple.

While you were acting on these views on your side of the Atlantic, we on this side, not less confident in our strength than in our rights, as you are now aware, were acting on another view, which is altogether different, namely, that we shall not acquiesce in any declaration of the government of France that assumes that this government is not now, as it always has been, exclusive sovereign, for war as well as for peace, within the States and Territories of the federal Union, and over all citizens, the disloyal and loyal all alike. We treat in that character, which is our legal character, or we do not treat at all, and we in no way consent to compromise that character in the least degree; we do not even suffer this character to become the subject of discussion. Good faith and honor, as well as the same expediency which prompted the proffer of our accession to the declaration of Paris, pure and simple, in the first instance, now require us to adhere to that proposition and abide by it; and we do adhere to it, not, however, as a divided, but as an undivided nation. The proposition is tendered to France not as a neutral but as a friend, and the agreement is to be obligatory upon the United States and France and all their legal dependencies just alike.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extracts.]

No. 42.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 21, 1861.

SIR: Your dispatch of June 28 (No. 10) has been received.

It must be confessed, therefore, that a new incident has occurred increasing the danger that what has hitherto been, and, as we think, ought to be, a merely domestic controversy of our own, may be enlarged into a general war among the great maritime nations. Hence the necessity for endeavoring to bring about a more perfect understanding between the United States and Great Britain for the regulation of their mutual relations than has yet been attained.

In attempting that important object I may be allowed to begin by affirming that the President deprecates, as much as any citizen of either country or any friend of humanity throughout the world can deprecate, the evil of foreign wars, to be superinduced, as he thinks unnecessarily, upon the painful civil conflict in which we are engaged for the purpose of defending and maintaining our national authority over our own disloyal citizens.

I may add, also, for myself, that however otherwise I may at any time have been understood, it has been an earnest and profound solicitude to avert foreign war; that alone has prompted the emphatic and sometimes, perhaps, impassioned remonstrances I have hitherto made against any form or measure of recognition of the insurgents by the government of Great Britain. I write in the same spirit now; and I invoke on the part of the British government, as I propose to exercise on my own, the calmness which all counsellors ought to practice in debates which involve the peace and happiness of mankind.

The United States and Great Britain have assumed incompatible, and thus far irreconcilable, positions on the subject of the existing insurrection.

The United States claim and insist that the integrity of the republic is unbroken, and that their government is supreme so far as foreign nations are concerned, as well for war as for peace, over all the States, all sections, and all citizens, the loyal not more than the disloyal, the patriots and the insurgents alike. Consequently they insist that the British government shall in no way intervene in the insurrection, or hold commercial or other intercourse with the insurgents in derogation of the federal authority.

The British government, without having first deliberately heard the claims of the United States, announced, through a proclamation of the Queen, that it took notice of the insurrection as a civil war so flagrant as to divide this country into two belligerent parties, of which the federal government constitutes one and the disloyal citizens the other; and consequently it inferred a right of Great Britain to stand in an attitude of neutrality between them.

It is not my purpose at this time to vindicate the position of the United States, nor is it my purpose to attempt to show to the government of Great Britain that its position is indefensible.

The question at issue concerns the United States primarily, and Great Britain only secondarily and incidentally. It is, as I have before said, a question of the integrity, which is nothing less than the life, of the republic itself.

The position which the government has taken has been dictated, therefore, by the law of self-preservation. No nation animated by loyal sentiments and inspired by a generous ambition can even suffer itself to debate with parties within or without a policy of self-preservation. In assuming this position and the policy resulting from it, we have done, as I think, just what Great Britain herself must, and therefore would do if a domestic insurrection should attempt to detach Ireland, or Scotland, or England from the United Kingdom, while she would hear no argument nor enter into any debate upon the subject. Neither adverse opinions of theoretical writers, nor precedents drawn from the practice of other nations, or, even if they could be, from her own, would modify her course, which would be all the more vigorously followed if internal resistance should fortify itself with alliances throughout the world. This is exactly the case now with the United States.

So, for obvious reasons, I refrain from argument to prove to the government of Great Britain the assumed error of the position it has avowed. First. Argument from a party that maintains itself to be absolutely right, and resolved in no case to change its convictions, becomes merely controversial. Secondly. Such argument would be only an indirect way of defending our own position, which is unchangeable. Thirdly. The position of Great Britain has been taken upon the assumption of a certain degree of probability of success by the insurgents in arms; and it must be sooner or later abandoned, as that probability shall diminish and ultimately cease, while in any case that circumstance does not affect our position or the policy which we have adopted. It must, therefore, be left to Great Britain to do what we have done, namely, survey the entire field, with the consequences of her course deemed by us to be erroneous, and determine as those consequences develop themselves how long that course shall be pursued.

While, however, thus waiving controversy on the main point, I am tempted by a sincere conviction that Great Britain really must desire, as we do, that the peace of the world may not be unnecessarily broken, to consider the attitude of the two powers, with a view to mutual forbearance, until reconciliation of conflicting systems shall have become in every event impossible.

The British government will, I think, admit that so soon as its unexpected, and, as we regard it, injurious position assumed in the Queen's proclamation became known to us, we took some pains to avert premature or unnecessary collision, if it could be done without sacrificing any part of the sovereignty which we had determined in every event to defend. We promptly renewed the proposition which, fortunately for both parties, we had tendered before that proclamation was issued, to concede as one whole undivided sovereignty to Great Britain, as a friend, all the guarantees for her commerce that she might claim as a neutral from this government as one of her two imagined belligerents. It seemed to us that these two great and kindred nations might decline to be dogmatic, and act practically with a view to immediate peace and ultimate good understanding.

So, on the other hand, it is my duty to admit, as I most frankly do, that the directions given by the British government that our blockade shall be respected, and that favor or shelter shall be denied to insurgent privateers, together with the disallowance of the application of the insurgent commissioners, have given us good reason to expect that our complete sovereignty, though theoretically questioned in the Queen's proclamation, would be practically respected. Lord Lyons, as you are aware, proposed to read to me a dispatch which he had received from his gov-

ernment, affirming the position assumed in the Queen's proclamation, and deducing from that position claims as a neutral to guarantees of safety to British commerce less than those we had, as I have already stated, offered to her as a friend. I declined, as you have been advised, to hear the communication, but nevertheless renewed through you, as I consistently could, the offer of the greater guarantees before tendered.

The case then seemed to me to stand thus: The two nations had, indeed, failed to find a common ground or principle on which they could stand together; but they had succeeded in reaching a perfect understanding of the nature and extent of their disagreement, and in finding a line of mutual, practical forbearance. It was under this aspect of the positions of the two governments that the President thought himself authorized to inform Congress on its coming together on the 4th of July instant, in extra session, that the sovereignty of the United States was practically respected by all nations.

* * * * *

I cannot leave the subject without endeavoring once more, as I have so often done before, to induce the British government to realize the conviction which I have more than once expressed in this correspondence, that the policy of the government is one that is based on interests of the greatest importance, and sentiments of the highest virtue, and therefore is in no case likely to be changed, whatever may be the varying fortunes of the war at home or the action of foreign nations on this subject, while the policy of foreign states rests on ephemeral interests of commerce or of ambition merely. The policy of these United States is not a creature of the government but an inspiration of the people, while the policies of foreign states are at the choice mainly of the governments presiding over them. If through error, on whatever side, this civil contention shall transcend the national bounds and involve foreign states, the energies of all commercial nations, including our own, will necessarily be turned to war, and a general carnival of the adventurous and the reckless of all countries, at the cost of the existing commerce of the world, must ensue. Beyond that painful scene upon the seas there lie, but dimly concealed from our vision, scenes of devastation and desolation which will leave no roots remaining out of which trade between the United States and Great Britain, as it has hitherto flourished, can ever again spring up.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

[Extracts.]

No. 21.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, July 22, 1861.

SIR: Your dispatches Nos. 24 and 25 are duly received. Dispatches 19, 22, and 24 treat in whole or in part of the same general matter.

I have read dispatch No. 19 with great interest. It had not occurred to me that you might deny to France and Great Britain an official reading of their dispatches which announced to our government their concession of belligerent rights to the South; or that, if you should do so, it would alter the relations of parties to the question. If it has that effect diplomatically, or relieves you from noticing their position, you were

certainly right. Indeed, I cannot see how, upon the ground that you put the matter, France has just cause of offense. You say merely you want no notice of a *purpose* by her to do what you consider an unfriendly act; that you will wait until the act is done before you choose to notice it; that, in other words, you choose to consider her as a friend until she shows herself by acts, not words, to be the contrary. * * *

The reasons assigned for your course you say I may communicate to the French government if I "shall find it necessary or expedient." I shall not fail to avail myself of this authority upon the earliest opportunity which shall be afforded for doing so. The just reasoning and the friendly tone of your dispatch will be invaluable for justification of your course and the prevention of difficulties. Unless, however, they refer to your action or make it a subject of complaint, it is, I suppose, not expedient for me to volunteer explanations. I was much surprised by one fact found in the dispatch from the French government left with you for an informal reading, to wit: "that you must not be surprised if France should address herself to a government which she says is to be installed at Montgomery for certain explanations." I could not have anticipated, from what had been said to me here, that such a course was in contemplation. Should they adopt it, the act would seem to me to approximate a recognition in this instance of the southern government more nearly than anything that has yet occurred. In that event, your future course will, no doubt, be guided by that wisdom which is so essential to carry us through the troubles of our present position. * * *

With much respect, I have the honor to be your obedient servant,
WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 35.] LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, August 22, 1861.

SIR: * * * *

In the course of our conversation I told him [M. Thouvenel] that any declaration or action which looked to or recognized a difference or distinction between the North and South was a matter upon which our government was, under the circumstances, peculiarly sensitive. That we treated with foreign governments for our whole country, North and South, and for all its citizens, whether true men or rebels, and when we could not so treat, we would cease to treat at all. He answered that they did not mean to contest our right to treat for the whole country, and that was not the purpose of the outside declaration they proposed to make; but having heretofore adopted a course of strict neutrality, the declaration in question was right and proper to prevent misconception and controversy in the future. * * *

With much respect, your obedient servant,
WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 1, 1862, p. 70.]

No. 78.

Earl Russell to Messrs. Yancy, Rost, and Mann.

FOREIGN OFFICE, August 24, 1861.

The undersigned has had the honor to receive the letter of the 14th instant, addressed to him by Messrs. Yancy, Rost, and Mann, on behalf of the so-styled Confederate States of North America.

The British government do not pretend in any way to pronounce a judgment upon the questions in debate between the United States and their adversaries in North America; the British government can only regret that these differences have unfortunately been submitted to the arbitrament of arms. Her Majesty has considered this contest as constituting a civil war, and her Majesty has, by her royal proclamation, declared her intention to preserve a strict neutrality between the contending parties in that war.

Her Majesty will strictly perform the duties which belong to a neutral. Her Majesty cannot undertake to determine by anticipation what may be the issue of the contest, nor can she acknowledge the independence of the nine States which are now combined against the President and Congress of the United States, until the fortune of arms or the more peaceful mode of negotiation shall have more clearly determined the respective positions of the two belligerents.

Her Majesty can, in the mean time, only express a hope that some adjustment satisfactory to both parties may be come to, without the calamities which must ensue in the event of an embittered and protracted conflict.

The undersigned, &c.,

RUSSELL.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 34.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, August 30, 1861.

SIR:

Although the matter is not altogether germane to the preceding, I will not close this dispatch without calling your attention to the copy of a letter of Lord John Russell to Mr. Edwardes, which I transmit as cut from a London newspaper, *The Globe*. It purports to have been taken from parliamentary papers just published, although I have not seen them, nor have I found it printed in any other newspaper. You will notice the date, the 14th of May, being the very day of my first visit to his lordship in company with Mr. Dallas, when he did not see us, as well as of the publication of the Queen's proclamation. I have reason to believe that the original form of that proclamation described the parties in America in much the same terms used by his lordship, and that they were only qualified at a very late moment, and after earnest remonstrance. The tone of the letter corresponds very much with that used to me, a report of which was transmitted in my dispatch No. 8.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Lord Russell to Mr. Edwards.

FOREIGN OFFICE, May 14, 1861.

It is for the Spanish government to weigh in the balance of their judgment the advantages and inconveniences which may arise from the annexation of the territory of the Dominican State to the dominions of Spain; and any opinion which her Majesty's government may form on the subject can be founded on no other consideration than a regard for what they may look upon as the real and permanent interests of Spain.

Her Majesty's government would, no doubt, have felt a strong and decided dissatisfaction at the proposed annexation if it had been likely to lead to the introduction of slavery into a community which is free from the taint of that pernicious institution; but the formal and repeated declarations of Marshal O'Donnell, that under no circumstances will slavery be introduced into the Dominican territory, have removed the main cause which would have led her Majesty's government to view the proposed annexation with dislike and repugnance.

Her Majesty's government certainly apprehended, when first this projected annexation was talked of, that it might, if carried into execution, involve Spain in unfriendly discussions, if not in conflict, either with France or with the United States, or with both. With regard to France, her Majesty's government have not learned that the French government has expressed any positive objection to the proposed arrangement, although she may not think it advantageous to Spain. It appears, also, from what has been stated to you, that there is no probability at present of any positive resistance to the measure, either by the northern or the southern confederation of North America. But the Spanish government should not too confidently rely on the permanent continuance of this indifference or acquiescence on the part of the North Americans; and it is not impossible that when the civil war which is now breaking out shall have been brought to an end, an event which may happen sooner than at present appears likely, both the North and the South might combine to make the occupation of the Dominican territory by Spain the cause of serious difference between the North American governments and that of Spain.

Her Majesty's government do not deny that Great Britain, as a power naturally inclined to peace, and systematically addicted to commerce, must always view a war between any two powers as an event not only at variance with her principles, but to a certain degree injurious to her interests. But with respect to Spain, the motives of the British government spring from far higher sources. Great Britain and Spain have for long periods of time, and in circumstances of high moment to each, been faithful and active allies; their alliance has been greatly useful and eminently honorable to both. It is a fundamental maxim of British policy to wish well to Spain, and earnestly to desire her welfare and prosperity; and therefore any combination of events which might at any time involve the possibility of Spain being engaged in a conflict which, from local circumstances and disadvantages, might be in the end seriously injurious to her rule over her ancient possessions, would be viewed by her Majesty's government with lively apprehension and sincere regret.

[The above letter was published in the *Globe* of or before August 30, 1861, as taken from British Blue Book, entitled "Papers relating to the annexation of Eastern St. Domingo to Spain;" p. 14.]

[Communicated with Mr. Adams's dispatch No. 44, to Mr. Seward, dated September 14, 1861.]

Lord Russell to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

FOREIGN OFFICE, *September 9, 1861.*

Her Majesty's government have already recognized the belligerent character of the southern States, and they will continue to consider them as belligerents. But her Majesty's government have not recognized, and are not prepared to recognize, the so-called Confederate States as a separate and independent state.

The undersigned requests Mr. Adams to accept the assurance of his highest consideration.

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 61.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, October 18, 1861.

SIR:

I have good reason to believe that, under the stimulus applied by the insurgent emissaries, some movements are making in Liverpool, Manchester, and London, as well as in other manufacturing places, to concentrate an influence upon the government to effect the purpose named. The result of it has as yet been made visible to the public eye only in the form which some of the casual public speeches take that are made by her Majesty's ministers. Several of these, as for example, the Duke of Newcastle, Lord de Grey, and Sir Robert Peel, have touched lightly upon the necessity of maintaining a rigid neutrality in our difficulties, whilst they have been more or less earnest in their friendly expressions towards the United States, according to their respective proclivities. But Lord Russell, in the address which he has lately made at Newcastle, at the banquet prepared in his honor, has gone a little further, and while professing neutrality as his doctrine, has undertaken to examine the nature of our struggle and to predict its results. According to him, it is a question between empire and independence, in other words, an exact repetition of the war of 1776. Of course, if the logical sequence of all the other portion of this address is to be rigidly adhered to, if the doctrine of leaving men to work out their own way without let or hindrance is the true foundation of the social economy, then does he regard the United States as wrong, and the insurgents as right. The former are to blame if they seek a reunion, because they would tolerate slavery thereby, but they are equally to blame if they endeavor to control the disposition to extend and perpetuate slavery. The alternative which his lordship's reasoning would seem to favor is the concession of a social system based upon the principle of the subjection of one race of mankind to the will of another, a very remarkable deduction for a states-

man claiming as the reward for his long public services the meed of praise for his consistent advocacy of popular rights.

But his lordship seems to my poor judgment to have made another mistake in this speech, in leaving some ground for an inference that there is, after all, something or other to be done by Great Britain towards putting an end to this lamentable state of things. It may be a mere fault of expression, not altogether unusual with his lordship, but it certainly does seem as if he not only felt that the United States were wrong, but that we ought to be somehow made sensible that we were so. It is therefore no cause for surprise to find the London Times of yesterday morning eagerly catch at this opening, and to demand what it is his lordship means by his innuendo. There can be no doubt that in this case, as in that of his speech in Parliament, in May last, he has done the very thing which he professes so great a desire to avoid, scattered such ambiguous voices as to increase the confusion he declares himself anxious to dispel.

It is this consideration that gives importance to the leading article in the London Post of yesterday morning, a newspaper which is understood here occasionally to express the sentiments of the prime minister, Lord Palmerston. I transmit a copy of that paper for your consideration, because I believe it to be intended to set at rest any doubts which might have arisen as to the intentions of the government at this moment. The reasoning, unlike Lord Russell's, is plain and clear, and straight to the point. There is no intention to interfere with the blockade, or to pronounce judgment in any way upon the merits of the American question. I have no reason to suppose that Lord Russell does not himself entirely concur in the justice of this policy. I believe him to be at heart more friendly to the United States than many who may profess a great deal more, but I am compelled to admit that during my short official relations with him, my experience cannot give testimony in favor of his mode of administration.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," 1862, No. 1, p. 102.]

No. 110.

Lord Lyons to Earl Russell.

[Extract.]

WASHINGTON, November 4, 1861.

In my immediately preceding dispatch of this date, I have reported to your lordship the substance of observations which Mr. Seward made to me the day before yesterday, with regard to the reception of confederate vessels in British ports. Mr. Seward concluded by saying that he earnestly wished this matter could be satisfactorily settled, because it now constituted the only "difficulty" between the United States and Great Britain. Perceiving that I did not immediately assent to this, Mr. Seward added, "It is, at all events, the only question we have against you; you may, perhaps, have something against us."

I thought it well to take advantage of the opening thus given to me, and to make some remarks to Mr. Seward on certain matters in which it appears to me that the course taken by the United States government is likely to have an unfortunate effect on the relations between the two countries.

I said to Mr. Seward that I could not but think that the extreme punctiliousness which he displayed with regard to communications between the British and French governments and the *de facto* government in the south was neither politic nor reasonable: the effect of it must be to keep open a constant source of irritation. It was impossible that such communications should not take place. Under present circumstances there was no authority in the southern States which could afford protection to the persons and property of the large number of British and French subjects established in those States, except the so-called confederate government. It was impossible, therefore, that we should "ignore" the existence of that government. The necessary intercourse with it had been hitherto carried on in the most unofficial manner, and with the most delicate regard to the susceptibility of the government and people of the United States. Was it a reasonable ground of complaint, or of strong—or, at least, discourteous—proceedings on the part of the cabinet of Washington? To put an extreme case—which, however, might not impossibly have happened in old times in Italy—suppose a band of brigands obtained possession of a town in which there were foreign consuls, foreign residents, and foreign property: could the government of the country be justly offended if the consuls made the best terms they could for their countrymen with the chief of the brigands, so long as their lives and fortunes were in his hands? I proceeded to give some instances of matters in which communication with the southern *de facto* authorities was necessary. I mentioned, among other cases, that of British property on board a vessel captured by a southern privateer. Was it an offense to the United States if the British consul should take steps to obtain the restitution of this property? Was it wise to push England and France to the wall? What could be the advantage of rendering it difficult to conduct this necessary intercourse in the quiet and unobtrusive manner which had been adopted?

Mr. Seward said that probably he should not think it necessary to take notice of an application from the restitution of captured property.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," 1862, No. 1, p. 111.]

No. 124.

Earl Russell to Messrs. Yancey, Rost, and Mann.

FOREIGN OFFICE, December 7, 1861.

Lord Russell presents his compliments to Mr. Yancey, Mr. Rost, and Mr. Mann. He has had the honor to receive their letters and inclosures of the 27th and 30th of November; but, in the present state of affairs, he must decline to enter into any official communication with them.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 168.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 23, 1862.

SIR:

We are embarrassed by the attitude of the British government in regard to the entertainment it gives in its ports to pirates engaged, without advantage to any loyal or humane interest in the world, in destroying our national commerce—a commerce only less important to Great Britain than it is to the American people. The President cannot but regard this misfortune as a consequence of precipitancy on the part of the British government which might well have been avoided.

I wait, however, before giving you instructions upon the subject, for the advices which are expected to indicate, if not determine, the future course of the British government in regard to our domestic affairs. Judging from present appearances, just what was required of us by foreign nations with unreasonable impatience is now in good time being accomplished. Federal forces, strong, well appointed, and superior in numbers, with all the needful material and means for effective action, confront the insurrection on every side. Its resources and strength are inadequate to resist the pressure, and it is expected soon to give way.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 179.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 5, 1862.

SIR: Your dispatch of January 17 (No. 103) fell upon the department as merely a small part of the largest foreign mail ever received here, and only after such delays as left insufficient time to dispose of the same before the departure of the outgoing steamer.

I approve entirely of your proceeding in regard to the Nashville, while I hail the solicitude of the British government for the preservation of peace in the British waters as a favorable indication. I have given to the Navy Department the information received from you concerning the probable attempt to transfer the Nashville to British owners.

I have given to Mr. Perry substantially the same ideas which I have expressed to yourself in regard to the uselessness to European maritime powers of a policy on their part which invites only insurgent privateers and repels loyal American commerce from their ports. It is easy to see that this is the effect of a premature recognition of the insurrection as entitled to belligerent rights.

We hear from various correspondents, as you do, that France proposed three months ago to Great Britain a recognition and intervention to break the blockade.

The communication of this kind which appeared to wear the highest character for authority was said to have come from the innermost circle of the British government. We have not credited it for this, among other reasons, namely: Lord Lyons, who, although a man of prudent reserve, is, at the same time, entirely truthful, has frankly told me that he knows nothing of the matter, while the French minister, who is a

very frank and friendly person, denies all knowledge of any such purpose. Further, Mr. Thouvenel's communications with us, made before and after the settlement of the Trent affair, are of such a character as to exclude a belief that France was, indeed, proposing to Great Britain a plot for the dismemberment of the Union. Moreover, I am slow to believe that either the government of France or the government of Great Britain misunderstand the true interests of their own country so much as to desire the dissolution of the Union, especially a dissolution to be effected by European intervention, and with the purpose of establishing a slaveholding power on the borders of the Caribbean sea.

We have unmistakable evidence that sympathizers with the secessionists will inaugurate a debate and motion for recognition in Parliament. Nor will I deny that I indulge some apprehension of the result. But, at the same time, I am not conscious of having left anything undone that could be done to enlighten the British government and the British public upon the merits of the question. The solution of it must be left to those who are expected to assume the responsibility. One thing is certain, so far as any future political event can be, and that is, that neither with nor without foreign aid will this Union be permitted by the American people to fall.

I cannot close this dispatch without expressing especial acknowledgments for the care and candor with which you have sifted the thick rumors of mischief, and given me what was worthy of consideration.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 182.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 13, 1862.

SIR:

Has not the policy of Great Britain in regard to our internal troubles been adhered to long enough? This is a question for the British government. If the British government shall still think it necessary to persevere, is it asking too much of them that they shall lend the protection of their courts to the enforcement of the neutrality which the Queen's proclamation commands.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

[Extracts.]

No. 114.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 19, 1862.

SIR: The lateness of the hour in which your dispatch of January 27, (No. 109) was received rendered a reply by the returning mail impossible.

I am glad that you have had so long and free a conversation with Mr. Thouvenel. Your report of it suggests the points to be noticed in this dispatch:

First. The subject of maritime law in regard to neutrals as affected by the present state of affairs in our country.

Second. The obstructions placed in Charleston harbor.

Third. Our present blockade.

Fourth. The progress and end of our military operations.

I begin by saying that, in my view, the whole difficulty which prevents correct views being taken on these subjects arises from one cause, namely, the fact that the European states have been from the first impatient of a civil war in America, and have thought that it could soonest be ended by pursuing a policy practically discouraging to this government. This is a mistake, against which we attempted to caution foreign powers in the beginning, earnestly, though respectfully. I have only to say upon that point now, that revolutions, especially those instituted on a large scale, and disturbing a government that extends over regions of vast extent, will not accommodate themselves to either the interested desires or the benevolent wishes of those who may be incidentally disturbed by them. Of all human transactions, a civil war is that which most requires to be treated practically, dispassionately, and with patience.

First. The subject of maritime law in regard to neutrals as affected by the present state of affairs in our country.

We remonstrated with the European states against recognizing the insurgents here as a belligerent power, on the ground that it was unnecessary, and would injuriously prolong the civil war. Our remonstrances were disregarded. Let European statesmen now take a retrospection of ten months of war, and say whether we were then in error. The Sumter and the Nashville, outlaws in America, are found disturbing the peace of Europe by piratical depredations on our commerce—the second commerce of the world—within sight of European ports. This is the extent of the naval strength of the new belligerent. What have not the European states lost by the terror struck into our commerce? Is it nothing that because of that unnecessary recognition our accession to the treaty of Paris, tendered by an administration favorable to neutral rights, has been rejected? Look at the insurrection, now breaking down before the mere array of national strength which meets it on every side, and say whether the same result would not have happened three months ago but for the hopes of recognition infused into the insurgents by their recognition as belligerents.

The Trent affair, all the world sees, was an accident for which not the least responsibility rests upon this government. For a time our national pride and passion appealed to us to abandon an ancient liberal policy; but, even though unadvised, we did not listen to it, and we are to-day, after that occurrence, as ready and as willing to join other maritime powers in mollifications of the law, to the extent that France desires, as we were before it happened, and before the civil war commenced. Forced into a belligerent attitude, and treated as such by neutral powers, we, of course, while these hostilities last, must claim for ourselves the rigors which other maritime powers agree to apply to us when we are neutrals. But even to-day, in the midst of this strife, if the other powers, including Great Britain, should agree to abolish naval blockades altogether and forever, and to exempt private property from confiscation in maritime war, we are prepared to consider the proposition. But we can make no proposition except as a whole nation. France and Great Britain, having declared the insurgents a belligerent, are not prepared to

treat with us as more than a part of a nation. Is it not clear that the sooner they reconsider that unnecessary step, so prematurely taken, the better it will be for all parties concerned ?

* * * * *

Fourthly. The prosecution and end of the civil war.

It has seemed slow and discouraging only because all parties accustomed to peace at home and abroad, and more or less dependent on American productions, commerce, and consumption, demanded that it should be brought to an end without allowing time and preparation. The time, however, has been gained, and the preparation has been made, and its satisfactory results are already known to the world. Let the European states acknowledge these results, and concede now to the Union half as much toleration as they have practically, though unintentionally, shown to disunion, and the civil war will come to an end at once. The insurgents would be without means, without credit and without power. Loyalty would resume sway in the insurrectionary States in place of treason, and the peace of the world would be restored. These reflections appear to me to be worthy the consideration of France. It seems to us, indeed, that France would consult her own true political interest by considering them; for government in France can stand on no other foundation than the democratic principle, while that principle must be surrendered as hopeless throughout the whole world if it be allowed to fail on this continent. The material interest of France counsels the consideration of these suggestions. For France will be prosperous only when the United States are united and at peace, and therefore also prosperous. I am aware that I have presented in this paper some facts and some thoughts contained in previous dispatches, but I have thought it not unprofitable to bring the discussion of the subjects involved into a form in which it may be submitted to Mr. Thouvenel. You will show him this paper, and give him a copy if he shall desire it.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 196.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 27, 1862.

SIR: *

For our own part, we must remain in the belief that the cause, and the only cause, of all the misapprehensions and embarrassments which have occurred affecting the two countries was an unnecessary and premature concession of belligerent rights to the insurgents. Nor do I know how just such mischiefs as are now apprehended can be prevented in any way other than by revoking that concession. The time is favorable to that revocation. Let Great Britain resume the relations she held to us when this attempt at revolution occurred: the revolution, already rapidly declining, would in that case become extinct at once. Much might yet be restored, and speedily restored, too, of that commerce so useful to both parties which the insurrection has suspended. Much might yet be regained of that friendship and fraternal feeling which only so recently were regarded by both parties as auspices of their per-

manent security in all their relations, and of the advancement of that civilization throughout the world to whose progress both of them are pledged.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 197.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, February 28, 1862.

SIR: The successes of the Union army in the west having brought the whole of Missouri and a large portion of Tennessee under the authority of the United States, and having already opened a passage for us into Alabama, Mississippi, and Arkansas, it has been determined to-day to permit the restoration of trade upon our inland ways and waters under certain limitations and restrictions, which may continue until the pacification of the country shall take place.

We are maturing the details of this system of inland trade carefully, and shall try its operation with a view to the adoption of measures of a similar nature, applicable to the country on the sea-coast, which would be some alleviation of the rigor of the blockade.

You may confidentially bring these facts to the notice of the British government. We could doubtless go much further and faster in the direction last indicated if we could have any reason to expect that concessions on our part would be met by a withdrawal, on the part of maritime nations, of the belligerent privileges heretofore so unnecessarily conceded, as we conceive, to the insurgents.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 199.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, March 6, 1862

SIR: *

Of all foreign nations Great Britain has the deepest interest in a speedy termination of the conflict and in a complete restoration of our national commerce, as no other nation has so great an interest in the relations of permanent friendship with the United States. If Great Britain should revoke her decree conceding belligerent rights to the insurgents to-day, this civil strife, which is the cause of all the derangement of those relations, and the only cause of all apprehended dangers of that kind, would end to-morrow. The United States have continually insisted that the disturbers of their peace are mere insurgents, not lawful belligerents. This government neither can nor is it likely to have occasion to change this position, but her Majesty can, and it would seem that she must, sooner or later, desire to relinquish her position. It was a position taken in haste, and in anticipation of the probable success of the revolution.

The failure of that revolution is sufficiently apparent. Why should not the position be relinquished, and the peace of our country thus be allowed to be restored?

Do you think Earl Russell, astute and well-informed as he is, could name one single benefit that Great Britain derives from maintaining a position which, although unintentionally, is so unfriendly and so injurious to us, or that he could designate one evil that would probably result to the country of whose foreign interests he is the guardian from the resumption of her long-established relations towards the United States? Is it not worth your pains to suggest to him the inquiry whether it would not be wiser and better to remove the necessity for our blockade than to keep the two nations, and even the whole world, in debate about the rightfulness or the expediency of attempting to break it, with all the consequences of so hostile a measure?

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

[Extract.]

No. 123.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, March 8, 1862.

SIR: Your dispatch of February 12 (No. 112) has been received. Surely all Europe ought to unite with us in establishing a telegraphic oceanic communication.

You very ably discuss the question of what is an effective blockade, while you suggest to me the desirableness of evidence to prove the efficiency of the one we have established.

We cannot know how many and what vessels succeed in running the blockade, and without this information statistics of the vessels prevented from doing so would be almost valueless. But the true test of the efficiency of the blockade will be found in its results. Cotton commands a price in Manchester, and in Rouen, and Lowell, four times greater than in New Orleans; salt, a price ten times higher in Charleston than in Liverpool. Gold is worth fifty per cent. more in Richmond than in New York. Notwithstanding the great outlay of the insurgents in Europe for arms, equipments, and clothing, in addition to their own boasted manufactures, the prisoners we take are wretchedly armed and clothed. Passengers from the insurgent States only escape into neutral states across overland barriers. Judged by this test of results, I am satisfied that there was never a more effective blockade. We are nevertheless very desirous to relieve the commerce of the world from our blockade, and to restore it to its natural and customary freedom. What do we wait for before doing this, but that the insurrection shall cease? What keeps the insurrection alive? Nothing, in my judgment, but the treatment of the insurgents as lawful belligerents by the maritime powers, utterly powerless as the former are to do any injury to foreign states. Their treatment as belligerents, while they are surrounded and hemmed within a small portion of the United States by the Union armies and navies, is believed to be without precedent as it is without necessity. Beside the commercial embarrassments which result from it, the United States are kept in continual and often unpleasant and anxious debate with maritime powers

whose sympathies cannot but be with them, because their interests are identical with those of our own country.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extracts.]

No. 203.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 10, 1862.

SIR: I have your dispatch of February 21, No. 119, which informs me, first, of the progress of the debate in Parliament concerning the alleged inefficiency of our blockade. I have already treated, sufficiently, I think, upon that subject. I will add, however, first, that I am credibly informed that the commander of the French fleet in our waters inspected the blockade, and thereupon stated to Mr. Mercier that it is as effective as it could be made by any navy in the world. Second, Memphis newspapers publish telegrams from New Orleans which they state that gold is at a premium there of sixty to sixty-five per cent.

I fall back upon the ground assumed in my recent dispatches. There is no need for further losses and sufferings in Europe by reason of our domestic troubles, and consequently no need for a continuance of the disturbance of relations between the maritime states of Europe and ourselves. Let the governments of Great Britain and France rescind the decrees which concede belligerent rights to a dwindling faction in this country, and all their troubles will come to a speedy end.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 209.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 15, 1862.

SIR: Your dispatch of February 28, No. 124, has been received. The information which it brings of the improved condition of public opinion in Great Britain in regard to our domestic affairs is highly gratifying.

Since the date of my last dispatch the Union forces have gained decided advantages. The financial and moral as well as the physical elements of the insurrection seem to be rapidly approaching exhaustion. Now, when we so clearly see how much of its strength was derived from the hope of foreign aid, we are brought to lament anew the precipitancy with which foreign powers so unnecessarily conceded to it belligerent rights. The President trusts that you are sparing no efforts to convince Earl Russell that the time has come when that concession can be revoked with safety to Great Britain and advantage to the great material interests of that country.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seaward to Mr. Adams.

No. 210.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 17, 1862.

SIR: Your dispatch of February 27, No. 123, has been received. I have communicated to the navy the information it gives concerning the Oreto.

The occupation of so many of the southern ports having been effected by our forces, and all of the others being now effectually invested, I apprehend that the illicit traffic which has been so flagrantly carried on from British ports will come to an end.

It is difficult for us to understand here why the maritime powers in Europe do not at once rescind their decisions concerning belligerent rights to insurgents who cannot send forth or receive one single vessel either for purposes of war or of commerce.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seaward.

No. 129.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, March 25, 1862.

SIR: Your dispatches Nos. 118, 119, and 120 were received by me on the 21st instant, and yet the contents of 118 and 120 have not, up to this date, been communicated to Mr. Thouvenel. This is owing to the fact that I received notice, on Sunday last, that he would not receive me until Friday next, and I did not feel that the dispatches were of a nature to justify a call for a special interview.

In the mean time the Emperor, without application on my part, by a note from his chamberlain, signified to me that he would receive me to-day at 2 p. m. Of course I availed myself of the opportunity, and have just returned from this personal interview. I was most kindly received, and he said at once that he had wished to have a talk with me about cotton, and the prospect of opening our ports. He spoke again of the great inconvenience connected with the existing condition of things, and feared it would not speedily come to an end; that the war might yet be a long one. He referred, too, to the probability of the South's destroying its cotton, &c. These, of course, are old matters, and I refer to them only as coming now directly from his Majesty. In reply, I thanked him for the opportunity of a direct personal conference, and assured him again of the confidence of our government in the early suppression of the insurrection. As to the burning of the cotton, I told him that it might be and doubtless would be done to a limited extent, but that little confidence was to be placed, in my judgment, upon the blustering resolutions and loud talk of southern people upon this subject; that I did not doubt, if we got possession of the country, enough of cotton would remain to supply the present European want. I then read to him your dispatches 118 and 120. He was aware that an army and fleet were on their way by sea to New Orleans, and asked, if we took that city, whether I thought they would then get a supply of cotton. I told him I had little doubt of it; that you had always represented that when we took possession of the country in which the ports were located the blockade would be removed, and when removed I thought that cotton, to a consid-

erable extent, would come forward. I then called his attention particularly to the suggestion in the latter part of your confidential dispatch No. 120. I told him we honestly believed that if a proclamation by France and England withdrawing belligerent rights from the insurrectionists should be made, the insurrection would collapse at once; that it was the moral support only which that concession had given them that had sustained them so far; that they had always looked to it as a first step towards their final recognition as an independent power. If the concession were withdrawn, I believed, as an equivalent, the blockade would be raised at an early day. He said the concession of belligerent rights was made upon an understanding with England; that some legal questions were involved in it originally, and that he would have to speak to Mr. Thouvenel about them. I called his attention to the fact that the confederate flag had been scarcely, if at all, seen in a port of France; that they had almost no commerce upon the ocean and scarcely the pretense of a navy; that the two vessels, (Nashville and Sumter,) which had alone been in European waters, had demeaned themselves as pirates rather than as ships of war; that a withdrawal of belligerent rights would, under these circumstances, take from the South no material advantage; it would only deprive them of the countenance and moral support of other nations. The Emperor replied that he must frankly say, when the insurrection broke out and this concession of belligerent rights was made, he did not suppose the North would succeed; that it was the general belief of statesmen in Europe that the two sections would never come together again. This belief, he intimated, was a principal reason why this concession of belligerent rights was then granted. He said now it was a large country, and for that reason difficult to subdue. I told him (as I had before told Mr. Thouvenel, in answer to the same objection) that we did not need to seize hold of a man's entire body to control him; that if we grasped firmly any sensitive extremities it was enough; that he had controlled Russia for the time being by taking possession of Sebastopol. I then called his attention to the few ports in the South, and the effect of seizing and holding them—excluding from the outer world the people of the interior whose entire surplus industry was devoted to raising articles for export. This advantage, in connection with the fact of the unquestionable existence of a large Union element in parts of the South, would, I thought, bring them into the Union again. Without expressing any opinion upon these matters, he said he would think of them, but hoped in the mean time that something would be done by us to relieve the difficulties here growing out of the want of cotton. I have heretofore expressed my earnest and perhaps somewhat urgent wish that this hope may be realized.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

[Extracts.]

No. 133.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 26, 1862.

SIR: Your dispatch of March 4 (No. 124) is received. It brings a casual conversation with which you were favored by his Majesty the

Emperor. While it was unquestionably proper that the President should be informed of the conversation, it will be for Mr. Thouvenel to decide whether he will entertain my comments upon it.

It is a pleasure to say that the remarks of his Majesty on that occasion, like the other communications which he has personally made to you, are manifestly sincere, grave, and earnest.

The substance of those remarks is, that he is very solicitous for an early termination of our domestic difficulties, because they are producing effects very injurious to the prosperity, and even calculated to disturb the tranquillity, of the French empire.

We have not been inattentive observers of recent occurrences in France, and thus we have become aware of the distress which prevails in many of the districts of that country, and of the popular movements which it has produced. While his Majesty would probably admit that other circumstances have combined with our unhappy civil strife in producing that distress, I am not at all disposed to deny that a large share of it is justly attributable to the latter cause. I can also very easily understand how naturally those classes of the French population which are most immediately affected trace all their troubles to that cause alone.

In behalf of the President, I can say, with the utmost frankness and sincerity, that he has not indulged a sentiment or a feeling during all our troubles that was not earnestly generous and friendly towards all foreign states, and especially so towards the government and the people of France. Indeed, it could not have been otherwise; for we have learned by painful and anxious experience that the first interests of every state are security and peace. Moreover, although the policy of France during our trials has not always been such as in the great straits through which we have passed we could entirely approve, yet, on reviewing the events of the year, I am able to admit that that policy was not unnaturally regarded by the Emperor as necessary under the aspect which our affairs assumed abroad. I can recall not one instance of disingenuousness or unkindness towards us in the intercourse which has taken place during that period between the two countries. Moreover, revolutions are epidemical; and, although we deem our own country to be now on the return to a condition of order and repose, we are not sure that new distractions would not befall us if revolutions should break out in western Europe. The United States are thus bound to desire the peace of all other nations. The Emperor may, therefore, rest assured that this government is not merely not indifferent to the wishes he expresses, but is desirous so to direct its proceedings as to meet and gratify them.

* * * * *

You will reassure the French government of the disposition and purpose of the President to remove the extraordinary restraints which have been laid upon commerce, just so far and so fast as it can be done compatibly with the attainment of the sole object of the contest on our part, namely, the re-establishment of the Union.

It would be disingenuous to close this communication without adding that now, as heretofore, it is the firm opinion of the President that it is in the power of the Emperor of France himself to render it absolutely certain that the efforts this government is thus making for the pacification of the insurgent region shall be crowned with immediate and complete success. The insurgents, hemmed in on all sides, without possessing a port or any other egress, and ruined and demoralized, as they are, are not any longer, even if at any previous time they have been, entitled to the forbearance of foreign powers as a public belligerent. Their per-

sistence in resisting the government of their country depends on the groundless hope of foreign intervention which they indulge. So long as they are regarded by foreign nations as a belligerent, they will not relinquish all expectation of such intervention. This view, however, has been already submitted to his Majesty more than once, and it is therefore unnecessary to enlarge upon it, or to re-enforce the arguments in support of it heretofore advanced. A new argument, however, offers itself at the moment when I am closing this dispatch. Information comes from Florida that the people of that State, whose ports and harbors have an importance in regard to commerce only inferior to their value in regard to naval defense, are already taking the incipient measures for a renunciation of disunion and a complete restoration of the authority of the United States.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 135.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, March 27, 1862.

SIR:

I am bound to notice, in several of your late dispatches, a strong disposition to press upon the British government an argument for a retraction of its original error in granting to the rebels the rights of a belligerent. There may come a moment when such a proceeding might seem to me likely to be of use. But I must frankly confess that I do not see it yet. The very last speech of Lord Russell in the House of Lords is, from beginning to end, inspired by an opposite idea. The final disruption of the United States and the ultimate recognition of the seceding States are as visible in every word of that address as they were in the letter of the same nobleman to Mr. Edwards on the 14th of May last. Lord Palmerston has entertained the same conviction. * * * The foreign policy of the government, upon which its friends almost exclusively depend for what is left it of popularity in the nation, rests upon this basis. * * * For these reasons I respectfully submit to your consideration my doubts about the expediency of moving in this direction now. Indeed, should it so happen that the existing indications of an early termination of the struggle continue to multiply, there will be little occasion for further remonstrance of any kind here; for the disposition to help a party, once that it is felt to be certainly sinking, is not very common among either political or commercial men; and there are no others in Great Britain who would stop to shed a tear over the fallen fortunes of the quasi belligerent of their own creation.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 131.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, March 31, 1862.

SIR:

I again called his (Mr. Thouvenel's) attention to the propriety of his government's retracing its steps in regard to its concession to the insurrectionists of belligerent rights, referring him to the considerations in reference thereto stated in your dispatches. He gave me no reason to suppose they would at present comply with this request. On the contrary, he said that it would scarcely be worthy of a great power, now that the South was beaten, to withdraw a concession made to them in their day of strength. I asked him, in reply, how long this concession was to last? how far it was expected we should go in crushing out this rebellion before it would be withdrawn? I said that it might well happen that, even after the southern ports were in our hands and their armies subdued, that bodies of men—brigands and guerillas—might be found in arms in some sections of the country, and I begged to know whether they were then yet to be considered as a "belligerent power?" whether their flag was yet to be respected? He said it was impossible to answer these questions without conference with England; that they had acted in these matters upon an understanding throughout. But, he said, if we took possession of the ports, the war would be altogether internal, and France would have nothing to do with it; that if we had the ports in our possession, no southern cruisers could get out, and the recognition of their flag would practically be a matter of no importance. I told him that some cruisers were already out—the *Sunter*, for instance. "Oh," said he, "she is fast; she can't move." I then told him that, aside from foreign ports, from sundry points upon our own coast, (not ports by law,) small armed craft might steal out to prey upon our coasting trade, if their right to do so was recognized by maritime nations. This fact, together with the countenance and moral support which the concession of belligerent rights gave to the rebellion, made it most desirable to the government of the United States that it should be ended. He seemed to think that we attached an undue importance to this. He said that their own consuls reported to them that the South were very much dissatisfied with France; that they complained that they had been badly treated, and threatened even to send their consuls and citizens out of the country. He said, furthermore, that we knew very well that all the sympathies of France and her people had been with the North from the beginning, and we could yet see how these sympathies tended from the mode in which the commissioners of the South had been received here.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 217.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 31, 1862.

SIR: I transmit to you herewith, for your information, the copy of a dispatch* of the 26th instant, addressed by this department to the minister of the United States at Paris, relative to his conversation on a late occasion with the Emperor of the French touching our domestic difficulties.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 218.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 1, 1862.

* * * * *

I have not failed to see that every wrong this country has been called to endure at the hands of any foreign power has been a natural, if not a logical, consequence of the first grave error which that power committed in conceding to an insurrection, which would otherwise have been ephemeral, the rights of a public belligerent. It has seemed, therefore, to be wise, as well as more dignified, to urge the retrogression upon that false step, rather than to elaborate complaints of the injuries which have followed it.

I shall not, in any case, be willing to assume as true the public interpretation of the proceedings of the government which imputes their origin to a sentiment of hostility on the part of the British people. Such a sentiment would be so unworthy of a great nation, and so fatal to all hopes of concert between that nation and our own, in advancing the interests of freedom, civilization, and humanity, that I prefer to find the cause of any injustice of which we have to complain in a failure of the British government itself to understand the true character and condition of the unhappy civil strife in which we are engaged.

Earl Russell, in the House of Lords, in the debate to which you have alluded, expressed the belief that this country is large enough for two independent nations, and the hope that this government will assent to a peaceful separation from the insurrectionary States. A very brief sojourn among us, with an observation of our mountains, rivers, and coasts, and some study of our social condition and habits, would be sufficient to satisfy him, on the contrary, that the country is not too large for one such people as this, and that it is, and must always be, too small for two distinct nations until the people shall have become so demoralized by faction that they are ready to enter the course which leads through continued subdivision to ultimate anarchy. All the British speculations assume that the political elements which have been brought into antagonism here are equal in vigor and endurance. Nothing, however, is more certain than that freedom and slavery are very unequal in these qualities, and that when these diverse elements are eliminated, the former from

* See dispatch from Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton, No. 133, March 26, 1862, ante.

the cause of sedition, and the latter from the cause of the government, then the government must prevail, sustained as it is by the co-operating sentiments of loyalty, of national pride, interest, ambition, and the permanent love of peace.

These opinions were early communicated to the British government, so far as it was proper to express them in correspondence with a foreign state. That government seems to have acted upon different convictions. The time has probably come for the practical determination of the great issue which has thus been joined. Although the past seventy years of the life of the United States were years of prosperity, yet an unhappy alienation prevailed during all that time between them and Great Britain. I see the United States now resuming their accustomed career by a renewal of the principles on which their existence depends. I doubt not that their future progress will be even more prosperous than the past. Let it be our endeavor to extirpate the seeds of animosity and cultivate relations of friendship with a nation that, however perversely it may seem to act for a time, can really have no interest or ambition permanently conflicting with our own.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 140.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, April 3, 1862.

SIR: I have to acknowledge the reception of dispatches from the department, numbered 209, 210, and 211. They make particular reference only to one subject, the revocation by Great Britain of her recognition of the insurgents as a belligerent. I have already in my dispatch, No. 135, of the 27th of March, submitted my views on the inexpediency of pressing the subject at this time. After consultation with some of our friends, I still adhere to the opinion. A few weeks more of news like that we have received for some time back may dispose of it without further difficulty. On the other hand, a contrary current would subject us to needless mortification in a refusal. There is no change worthy of note in the state of affairs here.

* * * * *

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 228.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 14, 1862.

* * * * *

While the President feels well assured that in any case the opening of our ports, following the anticipated successes of our arms, is not distant,

he is impressed with the opinion that it might be safely conceded at once, if the expectations of recognition of sovereignty by the principal maritime powers, which the insurgents have built upon their first recognition as belligerents, were removed. We are aware that the action of the maritime powers in the direction proposed must probably depend on their coming to the conviction that the insurgent cause has so far failed as to render their ultimate success in casting off the federal authority hopeless. It is the object of this paper to enable you to show the British government that such is the actual situation of affairs in this country. Your dispatch now before me intimates the opinion on your part that it would be indiscreet at the date of that paper to raise the question. A month full of military successes, resulting in great changes in the situation of the parties, has, however, elapsed since you received the information upon which that opinion was founded, and I am instructed to present the subject again, leaving you, however, absolutely free to determine for yourself the time and the manner when and in which you will bring it to the attention of Earl Russell. The President well understands that partisan and even national interests existing in Great Britain, and at the same time imperfectly understood here, must have much influence upon the exercise of the discretion thus confided to you. His object will be attained if you are only armed with the facts and the arguments proper for the occasion when it shall seem to yourself to have arrived.

* * * * *

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

[Extract.]

No. 138.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 15, 1862.

SIR: Your dispatch of March 25 (No. 129) has been submitted to the President.

It relates to a conversation which you held with the Emperor on the 25th of March last.

The President is pleased with the fact that you have had an opportunity, under favoring circumstances, to submit his opinion concerning the desirableness of a revocation of the imperial decree, by which the insurgents were recognized as a public belligerent.

The Emperor is understood to have avowed in that conversation that this decree was made upon the assumption, then commonly held by European statesmen, that this government would be unable to maintain the authority of the American Union. After discussing the changed condition of affairs, so far as it was then visible in Europe, his Majesty reverted to the question so naturally presented to his mind, whether cotton would be speedily procured from the United States when the national forces shall have come into occupation of the ports in the so-called cotton States.

I am instructed now to give you a more full and particular survey of our military position as it is at the present moment, to enable you to show to Mr. Thouvenel that it is such as authorizes friendly nations to assume, as a fact, the certainty of the failure of the insurrection.

Secondly, I am to show you how the immediate commercial interest of France is involved in an early revocation of the concession of belligerent rights to the insurgents.

We think we may safely submit to maritime nations the question, whether there is any longer the least ground to apprehend a failure of this government to restore the federal authority in the revolutionary section, and to maintain and preserve the federal Union. If this is so, is it generous, just, or wise for friendly states any longer to recognize the insurgents as a public belligerent?

The questions how soon cotton can be gotten, and how much cotton, of course, depend mainly upon the point how soon, and how completely, the insurrection shall cease. The Emperor of France need not be told that terror precedes and desolation follows the track of armies, and that when war has ceased, industry resumes its haunts and habits just in the degree that they have left unexhausted the resources of the country.

We have seen that the insurgents threaten to destroy the cotton already in store, and to prevent the new planting of that important staple. Why? There is a reason frankly assigned by them, namely, to *compel* France and Great Britain to become their allies in a war against our own country. Why do they still dream that such alliances are yet possible? Only because they have seen France and Great Britain seem to hesitate whether to look for cotton through the overthrow of the Union or through its success in arms. In the President's opinion, it is this attitude of maritime powers alone that now prolongs the war. The war will indeed speedily come to an end, in which the Union will triumph, even though that attitude of friendly nations remains unchanged; but the end would follow all of a sudden the change of attitude. There is no doubt that the blockade might be safely removed, and cotton, tobacco, and other southern productions left to flow freely out of the southern ports, if commercial states should now come to the conclusion to know and regard the flag of the Union as the only one in our country entitled to be known in their commercial and political intercourse.

It is proper that you should be informed that a dispatch, essentially similar to this, has been transmitted to Mr. Adams, with instructions to exercise his discretion as to the time when its suggestions shall be communicated to the British government. You will exercise a like discretion on your part.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 144.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,

London, April 16, 1862.

SIR: I have this morning received dispatches from the department, numbered from 214 to 217, inclusive. I yesterday succeeded in obtaining the expected conference with Lord Russell. I began by reading to him the copy of your dispatch, No. 8, containing instructions to Mr. Burlingame, in China, agreeably to your direction, and I made an offer to leave a copy with him, which he accepted.

I then opened the main topic with which I was charged. I expressed to his lordship my reluctance to touch upon any subject which looked

like complaint at this time, when everything was so quiet between the two countries, but it seemed to be the duty of public men not to confine themselves merely to the study of the present. If there were reasons to suspect the existence of causes of irritation which might lead to serious differences between nations, even at a remote period, it was the part of prudence to make an early effort to remove them. In this sense I desired to speak of the tendency of the efforts continually making here, reports of which were sent by every steamer to America, to supply to the insurgents the means of persevering in their resistance to the government. It could not admit of a doubt that their hopes of final success, though much weakened, were still buoyed up by the encouragement obtained in the supplies from here. On the other hand, the people of the United States drew inferences of a hostile disposition to them in a corresponding degree from the same sources. I was bound in frankness to add that the various occurrences which confirm this notion were too apt to revive the recollection of the original measure to which they were traced as natural consequences. I had reason to believe the government to be so strongly convinced of the fact that the original recognition of the rebels as a belligerent was their only remaining moral support, that I felt it my duty once more to bring the subject to the attention of her Majesty's government. Although I had heretofore received repeated requests so to do, I had been indisposed to press it, from a belief that any such movement would be unavailing. In a late visit to Paris, however, where I had conferred with Mr. Dayton, I had learned from him that in a personal conversation with the Emperor, in the course of which the latter had represented the urgency of the necessity for cotton, he had, in reply, dwelt upon the difficulties experienced from the effects of the Emperor's recognition of the belligerent right of the rebels in prolonging the war, and had pressed for the withdrawal of it. The Emperor had not shown himself averse to entertaining the question, but had referred to his co-operation with Great Britain and to the necessity it imposed of consultation with it in this case. The knowledge of this fact had determined me on my side to propose the same thing here. I should not go into any repetition of the argument on the subject, but should content myself with expressing the conviction that nothing would more conduce to establish perfect confidence in the disposition of Great Britain, and to accelerate the reopening of the customary intercourse and trade between the two countries, than such a step.

His lordship alluded, first, to my report of Mr. Dayton's conversation with the Emperor. He presumed it was confidential, and therefore he could take no cognizance of it. All that he was bound to know was what had been mentioned by Mr. Thouvenel to Lord Cowley of Mr. Dayton's conference with him. He had only learned by this that there was some general conversation. He did not learn that Mr. Dayton had offered any distinct proposition. No reference of the matter had been made to this government by the French. I said this was precisely the point I desired to arrive at. The impression I received was that such a reference had been promised.

I did not tell Lord Russell the most significant portion of Mr. Dayton's report of his conversation with the Emperor, because I felt bound not to commit him. From the tenor of yours to me (No. 217) of the 31st March, I am led to believe you are fully possessed of it. My object was simply to see where the responsibility for the policy rests; a discovery which a comparison of the tone maintained by the respective parties renders it not difficult to reach.

His lordship enlarged once more upon the magnitude of the region

engaged in the revolt, and upon the urgency of the call to provide for the new emergency. He attempted an analogy between the course taken by Great Britain in this case and that of the United States towards South America after the revolt of the dependencies of Spain. Subsequent events had only confirmed the correctness of the decision. For the very efforts to which the United States had been compelled to resort proved the magnitude of the task undertaken, and they were still engaged in pursuing their object without absolute certainty of success. The wish of Great Britain was to remain neutral and impartial. They had no cause of quarrel with the southern States. We might fight it out with them. The southern people seemed, from the accounts in the morning papers, to be finding equal fault on their side for their not taking part with them. We, on our part, seemed to be urging for what was equivalent to joining our side to put them down, yet that was a course which we had professed not to desire.

To this I replied, that very certainly we did not desire it. What we did desire was, that foreign nations would leave the matter entirely in our hands. What we complained of was, that the course adopted was not neutrality. That it had not been so regarded by the insurgents themselves was made apparent in the very documents published at the opening of Parliament; for it was certain that the early overtures made by the two powers to obtain a sanction of the declaration of Paris, had been construed at Richmond, and, as I thought, with reason, as a ground to expect a further acknowledgment. It seemed to me they had some right to complain of a disappointment of their hopes then raised. I begged, furthermore, to advance an opinion that there was not an example in all the history of the United States or of Great Britain, nay, I might say of any civilized nation of the world, of so precipitate a recognition of belligerent rights to insurgents as this one of which we were treating. If there was such an instance, I should be glad to see it. Upon the basis thus made, there could be no question that much of the perseverance in resistance had rested, and did still rest. A withdrawal of this recognition was the only thing that would put an end to the delusion. On the other hand, the continuance of it but served to countenance and to stimulate the efforts pertinaciously made by people in Great Britain to sustain them. This led me naturally to enlarge upon the effect produced upon the people of the United States, as well as the government, by the frequent accounts of the manner in which vessels of all kinds were fitted out from the ports of Great Britain to assist the insurgents. Most of the consuls weekly sent home a repetition of the same story. I had even been told by one of them lately, that he believed as many as fifteen vessels were now preparing to make the voyage. Such things could not go on without giving rise to unpleasant implications, which, however unfounded, would be likely to be so far credited as to render them as dangerous as if they were facts. I remarked that his lordship must be aware that the answer that nothing could be done was very unsatisfactory; because it might be fairly presumed that every nation that possessed the will naturally carried within itself the power to prevent abuses of its authority.

His lordship replied, in substance, by expressing his belief that the parties engaged in these undertakings were not so much interested in the cause of the insurgents as in the profits to be expected by running the blockade. Such attempts always would be made in similar cases. For the rest, these adventurers were compelled to take their own risk. They had the dangers of capture to encounter, and the certainty of be-

ing deprived of their rights of reclamation. The government had no disposition to give them protection.

I observed that this reasoning seemed hardly satisfactory or consoling to persons exposed by the effects of such acts to a long and painful and costly extension of their labors of repression. I then put it to his lordship, distinctly, if Great Britain would be contented, should the people of Canada break out into open rebellion, to find the United States promptly declare a neutrality, recognize the rebels as a belligerent power, and then, from myriads of posts along the extensive line of boundary and the many harbors on the seaboard, tolerate the equipment and dispatch of numerous vessels freighted with all the materials necessary to protract the struggle? I very much doubted whether his lordship would be perfectly quiescent under the answer that no violation of neutrality had been committed, and that no power existed to put a stop to the proceedings. His lordship met this by saying, that he should certainly object to any such *direct* expeditions; but there was no evidence, in any of the cases I had brought up, of destination or of wrong intention. In that of the Oreto, upon which I had addressed a note to him, he had directed an investigation to be made, and the authorities at Liverpool had reported that there was no ground for doubting the legality of her voyage.

I replied that this was exactly what gave such unpleasant impressions to us in America. The Oreto, by the very paper furnished from the custom-house, was shown to be laden with a hundred and seventy tons of arms, and to have persons called *troops* on board, destined for Palermo and Jamaica. The very statement of the case was enough to show what was really intended. The fact of her true destination was notorious all over Liverpool. No commercial people were blind to it. And the course taken by her Majesty's officers in declaring ignorance only led to an inference most unfavorable to all idea of their neutrality in the struggle. It was just such action as this that was making the difficulties of our government in the way of giving the facilities to the supply of cotton, which they hoped to furnish in a short time, if the whole control of means to put an end to the contest was left to them.

His lordship concluded by a polite expression of regret at these circumstances, at the same time that he could not see how the government could change its position.

I concluded the conversation by saying that I had only done my duty.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

Secretary of State.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 137.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, April 17, 1862.

SIR: * * * * * *

Your reference to the question of a withdrawal by France of the concession of belligerent rights to the South is noted. I will keep the suggestion in view, but you will have already learned, by a subsequent

16 A C—VOL. I

dispatch from me, that I have fully presented that matter both to the Emperor and to Mr. Thouvenel.

I have forbore to address them in writing upon this subject, because I feared that a direct and formal refusal would commit this government still further, and make the matter worse. Besides, did you not refuse to take official notice of the fact that such concession ever was made? Mr. Adams, on a recent visit here, informed me that he had not yet addressed the British government upon this question, but having learned what had been done here, he would now make the suggestion there. As these governments act upon an understanding on this question, it is, perhaps, not wise for me to go further until it shall appear that some suggestion has been made in England.

I was happy to receive a visit from Mr. Adams, and to confer with him upon this and other matters.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 235.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 19, 1862.

SIR: Your dispatch of April 3 (No. 140) has been submitted to the President, together with the note addressed to you by Earl Russell, bearing on the subject discussed. All the grievances which disturb our people, and tend to alienate them from Great Britain, seem deducible from the concessions made by her to the insurgents at the beginning of this civil war. All the explanations we receive from Great Britain seem to imply a conviction that this civil war must end in the overthrow of the federal Union. The ultimate consequence of such a calamity would be that this great country would be divided into factions and hostile states and confederations, as Greece and Italy and Spanish America have been.

You can do no more, in the present conjuncture, than to give his lordship, from time to time, fresh and accumulating evidence of our purpose and our ability to pursue to a successful end the course which we have learned from our British ancestry, namely, to hold the constituent States of our great realm in perpetual and indissoluble union. You will, as I have before advised, do this in such way and at such times and seasons as your own discretion may approve.

If the British government shall do us full justice, they will be satisfied that the change of attitude we ask is suggested by us upon a profound conviction that it would be equally beneficial to Great Britain and to the United States. The President cannot consent to be responsible, now or hereafter, for any degree of alienation between the two countries which is now arising, or which shall reveal itself hereafter.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

No. 146.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 28, 1862.

SIR: You will fully appreciate the importance of the capture of New Orleans, which was effected by our naval expedition, exclusively, on the 24th instant. The news reached us through insurgent organs last evening. As yet, we have not received details, nor can we fully apprehend, at so early a moment, the changes in the plans of the insurgents which this great event must produce. It is hardly to be doubted that it will enable us, before another dispatch-day shall arrive, to restore the mails to that great commercial city under such restraints, not oppressive to innocent commercial intercourse, as the military exigencies will permit.

We were, indeed, just maturing a plan for that purpose when intelligence of the great victory arrived.

We hear that Captain Bullock, of Georgia, writes from London that he is sending out five steamers which he has purchased, fitted, armed, and supplied with materials of war, in England, to prosecute a naval war against us. This can be regarded as nothing less than a piratical invasion of this country from Europe, under the toleration of European powers. We do not doubt our ability to meet and overcome it. But it seems to us worthy the consideration of maritime states, whether our success in maintaining the integrity of our country shall be necessarily accompanied with the conviction, fixed forever in the public mind, that Europe lent its aid to the abortive revolution.

The President knows that France has wished us well. Would it not be well for her to signalize her aversion from the designs of European conspirators?

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 240.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 28, 1862.

SIR: To-day the country is assuming that the fate of this unnatural war is determined by the great event of the capture of New Orleans, which was effected by a naval expedition on the 24th instant. I trust that the anticipation will be sustained.

Captain Bullock, of Georgia, is understood to have written that he has five steamers built, or bought, armed, and supplied with material of war in England, which are now about leaving, or are on their way, to aid the insurgents.

We are prepared to meet them. But the reflection occurs, are the maritime powers of Europe willing that the suppression of this insurrection shall be forever associated in the memory of mankind with the conviction that the sympathies of Europe were lent to the abortive revolution?

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

No. 148.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 1, 1862.

SIR: The President, as you have been already informed, is directing that measures be taken to mitigate the rigor of our blockade, with a view to the relief of France, whom we would not willingly see suffer unnecessarily, by reason of the calamities which have befallen our own country. I have so often said that the concession of belligerent rights to the insurgents has aggravated and prolonged these calamities that I need not now repeat that remark. I may, however, observe with entire propriety, I think, that the United States have a right to expect, at least, actual neutrality from foreign governments which have proclaimed it. Certainly, France, while looking to us to mitigate our war in the interest of herself, and other friendly nations like herself, could not, without protest, see the same war prosecuted against us by subscription among the merchants of England. Entertaining this opinion, I send you a copy of a recent letter which has been received from our consul at Liverpool, and of a letter founded thereupon which I have addressed to Mr. Adams.

The pain inflicted by transactions like this is mitigated by the concession which other nations imply in their treatment of us, namely: that we are strong enough to overcome our domestic enemies with all the aid they can unlawfully obtain abroad, and that we are believed capable of being generous to any extent that foreign interest, passion, or prejudice shall seek to profit by our national misfortunes.

But this consideration does not tend to the consummation which is necessary for ourselves and for the world. We want peace with independence, and it is equally the interest of France and of Great Britain that we be, as soon as possible, allowed to enjoy them. Let us have, on all sides, true neutrality, and this hateful and injurious domestic strife will, within a very few months, be remembered only as a lesson full of instruction to all nations.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 245.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 6, 1862.

SIR: Your dispatch of April 16, No. 144, has arrived this morning, and the mail for Europe closes this evening.

I advised you by telegrams, sent out by the last steamer, of the capture of New Orleans. I have now to inform you that Fort Macon has surrendered to our siege, and that Yorktown has just been relinquished to our army on the eve of an anticipated bombardment. General McClellan is marching up the Peninsula towards Richmond, and General McDowell is opening his way downward towards the same capital from Fredericksburg.

If our information is correct, the insurgent army is evacuating Corinth. The spurious congress of the insurgents has suddenly adjourned. Their fiscal system must by this time have exploded, and their military connections are everywhere broken. It is a very pleasant addition to this

news that two of the British steamers lately fitted out at Liverpool, with ammunition and arms for the insurgents, have been captured by our blockading fleet. Thus the tide of success seems to be flowing full and strong. Acting upon the confidence which it has produced, we have opened New Orleans to correspondence, and we are taking measures for an early opening of that and some other ports to trade, under necessary limitations.

These concessions occur simultaneously with our ratification of a treaty with Great Britain designed to effect the suppression of the African slave trade.

Never were the influences of time and distance upon political opinions and proceedings illustrated more strongly than in the contrast which these transactions present to the course pursued and the sentiments avowed by the British government, as reported to us in your dispatch.

The British government at London, on the 16th of April, reasoned and acted from the case as it stood here on the 1st of April. We are reviewing the proceedings and language of the British government in view of the case as it stands now, on the 5th of May. We are sure, however, that Great Britain will not insist that the insurgents shall be regarded as a public belligerent after they shall have ceased to be able to maintain an organized war.

The President desires that, if it shall seem to you discreet, you recall the subject to Earl Russell's attention, after the events which have recently occurred here shall have transpired in Europe. It will be a sufficient justification for the seeming impatience that the interests of both nations, and even the interests of humanity, require that a war which so severely, and yet so unnecessarily and so hopelessly, scourges society, should not be protracted through any seeming indifference to the evil on the part of the maritime powers.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

No. 149.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 5, 1862.

SIR: As you will be more particularly informed by papers sent herewith, New Orleans is opened to the mails. A collector has also proceeded there to take measures for opening that port. Other ports will be opened, also. The Treasury, War, and Navy Departments are completing the details of preparation. The fall of New Orleans, Fort Macon, and Yorktown in rapid succession has produced a general expectation of peace. No one, on either side of the contest, dreams of peace otherwise than with the complete restoration of the Union. Indeed, the whole country feels that this consummation has actually begun. How strangely in contrast with this conviction are the coldness and indifference manifested by maritime powers, and the crowding of our coasts with contraband European vessels, freighted with arms and munitions of war, vainly consigned to the insurgents! France, Belgium, and Great Britain, while suffering the sorest privations, are, nevertheless, constantly sending hither on desperate ventures the means to protract the calamitous war they deprecate. We shall have peace and Union in a very few months, let France and Great Britain do as they may. We should have them in one month if

either the Emperor or the Queen should speak the word and say, If the life of this unnatural insurrection hangs on an expectation of our favor, let it die. To bring the Emperor to this conviction is your present urgent duty. If successful in performing it, you will render a benefit to France worth more than any conquest, while you will direct a stream of healing oil upon the wounds of our own afflicted land. The President prays and trusts that you may succeed.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

No. 151.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 7, 1862.

SIR: Your dispatch of the 22d of April (No. 141) has been received.

I am very glad to know that you communicated what I have before written you about the purpose of this government to open southern ports as early as should be possible.

Although New Orleans was captured on the 24th of April, and has since been fully possessed and occupied, we have not yet received official information of the fact, nor has the treasury been able to perfect there the arrangements necessary for the restoration of trade. These arrangements are now being completed, and I expect that the same steamer which will carry out this dispatch will also carry to Europe the proclamation for the restoration of commerce. That proclamation, I think, may be regarded by the maritime powers as an announcement that the republic has passed the danger of disunion, and is ready once more to renew its course of beneficent enterprise.

The Emperor of the French can readily understand how much difficulty we have found in opening our ports to the maritime powers which have so long and so persistently and so unnecessarily conceded belligerent privileges to a faction which was waging war for the desolation of our country. It will be a study for the historian, why those powers, on the first sound of the bugle of faction, so absolutely abandoned all their former faith in the government and people of the United States. We have deeply desired that France, our earliest friend and the only ally we ever had, should rise above the other nations in appreciating the virtue and the capacity of the American people. We have thought that it would be even useful to France herself to assume such an attitude. We have been thus far disappointed, but we do not, therefore, mean to be unjust. We acknowledge that France has faithfully practiced the neutrality she proclaimed, and that in the whole progress of the domestic strife she has not only spoken the language, but acted in the character, of a well-wisher and a friend.

The year of the American insurrection will be known in the history of mankind as one of disaster and fearful apprehension to all nations. It has been our study so to conduct public affairs with foreign nations, as to cast off from the government itself all accountability for the unnecessary aggravations of what might and ought to have been only a brief and local political disturbance, resulting from a sudden gust of popular passion.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 159.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, May 15, 1862.

Sir:

This matter having been disposed of, I then remarked that I was still in the receipt of letters from my government, urging me to continue to press her Majesty's minister for some action on the subject which I had heretofore labored so much to present to his attention. But, as I had little confidence in the success of any repetition I might make of my former arguments, I hoped his lordship would permit me to read to him the last dispatch which had reached me. I had not, indeed, been directed to lay it before him, nor to leave a copy of it. The time and manner of using it had been left wholly to my discretion; but as it seemed to me to have been carefully and elaborately drawn, as a full exposition of the views of the government at this crisis, I was of opinion that it was no more than just to both parties that it should be communicated *in extenso*. His lordship said he should be glad to hear it, and then I read all of it but the single passage at the close of the first paragraph.

After I had done, his lordship remarked that he had no disposition to call in question any of the statements made in the dispatch. It might be just as there alleged; but there still remained much to be done; New Orleans, Savannah, and Charleston continued in the possession of the other party, and the resistance of the great armies left the result yet awaiting further development.

I replied to this by saying, that from the outset I had entertained little doubt of what the end of this struggle would be, provided that we were left entirely to ourselves to work it out. In my mind, that end was now rapidly approaching. I had become much more concerned in considering what the state of things was likely to be after it had been attained. It was with very great regret I was compelled to express my conviction of the rapid increase, among the people of the United States, of feelings of irritation and bitterness towards this country. I received the evidence of it from so many and such opposite sources that I could not question the fact. My own disposition had been, and continued to be, of the most friendly character; but I very much feared that if her Majesty's government did not hold forth some means which would enable its friends to maintain the existence of a reciprocal feeling, the seeds would be planted of a hostility that would bear bitter fruit for the whole of the next generation.

His lordship replied that it was much to be regretted, but the fact was that this hostile feeling had always prevailed in America. Down to the period of the Prince of Wales's visit, whatever the English had done, it seemed to animate all classes alike to take it amiss. Even such a person as Mr. Everett, from whom better things might be expected, seems to omit no opportunity of finding fault with what they did, and stimulating the popular prejudice at their expense. It seemed a hopeless task to attempt to correct this tendency.

I then begged leave to suggest to his lordship whether there was not another side to the picture. I thought I was in a situation to present it, for I had had peculiar opportunities for observing it, from the fact that members of my family had repeatedly been called to act on the scene. Immediately after the peace of 1783, my grandfather had been sent here as

the first minister. He came with a disposition to establish the most friendly relations. He had not been favorably impressed with the policy of the French government, and was anxious to equalize the balance of influence in America; and, so well was this known, that the King, George III, at his audience, appeared to me to have stepped to the verge of the proprieties of his position in making allusion to it. Then was the first opportunity to conciliate America; and Mr. Pitt seemed to have conceived the idea. Had the commercial policy he recommended been adopted, the United States would have been more closely bound to this country after their independence than they ever had been whilst colonies. In lieu of this, the principles of Lord Sheffield's pamphlet were accepted, and it was decided to await the possibilities of an unfavorable issue to our experiment of government. The natural consequence was an alienation, which ended in the war of 1812. At the close of that war, my father was sent here to do what he could to effect a re-establishment of amicable relations. His disposition was all that could be wished. It was met by indifference and repulsion. From that period I had every reason to know the impressions that had gone far to regulate his action as a public man, down to the close of his life, toward Great Britain. And now I had come here with the most anxious desire to preserve relations of amity, which seem latterly to have been taking a more positive character than ever before. I had done everything in my power during my residence to that end. I was anxious, whenever I might return home, to have the means of making a favorable report to my countrymen. I supplicated his lordship then not to compel me to go back without the possession of the smallest evidence that could refute the inevitable arguments that would be drawn from the position that Great Britain had thus far chosen to assume during this struggle. * * *

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

No. 147.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, May 16, 1862.

SIR: Your several dispatches from No. 138 to No. 146, both inclusive, have been received.

Dispatch No. 138, received on the 7th instant, gives a summary of our military position for the purpose of enabling me to satisfy Mr. Thouvenel that the government of France should assume as a fact the certain failure of the insurrection, and that its commercial interests demand a withdrawal of the concession of belligerent rights to the insurrectionists.

I am waiting in daily expectation of hearing what Mr. Adams has done in England upon this question. Without this knowledge, I do not feel that it would be wise or prudent to urge the point further at the present moment.

My dispatch of March 31 (No. 131) gives you the substance of a conversation with Mr. Thouvenel upon this point, which is subsequent in date to that with the Emperor, to which your dispatch refers. The question of the propriety of revoking this concession of belligerent rights has been presented to this government so distinctly and earnestly that I am quite sure the answer of Mr. Thouvenel, given in that dispatch, was

upon full advisement. Without a still further change for the better in the condition of things at home, or some encouraging information from Mr. Adams, I hesitate to urge the point further at present. It might be considered as savoring of opportunity, or, at all events, as wanting in that diplomatic forbearance which this government would have a right to expect. This remark applies only to my further and immediate action upon this question; not at all to your dispatch. At the time that dispatch was written you were yet ignorant of my last conversation with Mr. Thouvenel. The misfortune is that, acting upon previous instructions, I have, in this respect, anticipated your wishes. But the course of events has already greatly added to the strength of our position. Each day adds a new argument to the strength of our claim upon these governments for a revocation of that unwise concession. If, in addition to the taking of New Orleans, our armies at Yorktown and Corinth should be successful, there would scarcely remain a plausible excuse with which to evade our demand. It can hardly be that so good a government as that of France will long continue a wrong which commenced in a wholly mistaken view of the policy and power of the United States. But in the present condition of things—our armies yet facing each other in the field, and the dénouement daily expected—the French government will probably wait the result.

I shall avail myself of the contents of your dispatch at an early day, and hope, in the mean time, that coming events may even add to its force.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

HON. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

P. S.—Since writing the above I have received a communication from Mr. Adams, which informs me that the British government had “no intention to vary the policy” adopted heretofore; and he states, further, that after having read your late dispatch upon this question “the answer was that the great ports were not yet in our possession, and the issue appeared yet uncertain.” * * *

Under these circumstances, I shall await the development of a few days more, at least, before addressing myself again upon this point to the French government. D.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 164.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, May 22, 1862.

SIR: I have to acknowledge the reception of dispatches from the department, numbered from 243 to 246, both inclusive, and also of two printed circulars dated, respectively, on the 3d and 5th of May, consequent upon the recovery of New Orleans.

I am not aware of any matter contained in these which calls for particular notice, unless it be the injunction upon me to renew my appeals to the government of Great Britain for the revocation of the recognition of belligerent rights, its original false step.

I had little expectation of success, but I felt it my duty at once to execute the orders. So, after the forms in connection with the slave trade treaty on Tuesday had been completed, I asked the favor of a few minutes' further conversation on this subject. I alluded to the fact of your reception of my report of our last conference, and to your com-

ments on it, which had just reached me. I told him that you thought the course of events, and the decided turn the fortunes of war had taken since the date of that conference, justified you in presuming that some alteration in the views of the government must have ensued. I dwelt somewhat upon the unfavorable impression that act had made on the people of the United States. It was the true root of the bitterness towards Great Britain that was felt there. All the later acts of assistance given here by private persons to the rebels, the knowledge of which tended to keep up the irritation, were viewed only as natural emanations from that fatal source. Every consular report that went, and there were a good many, giving details of ships and supplies and money transmitted to keep up the war, served merely to remind us of the original cause of offense. I did hope, then, that he would consider, before it should be too late to be useful, the expediency of some action that might tend to soften the asperity thus engendered. I believed that in your urgency you were actuated by a sincere desire to maintain kindly relations between the two countries, and to that end you labored to procure the removal of this unlucky obstruction. I certainly acted in that spirit myself.

His lordship replied by saying that he did not see his way to any change of policy at present. We seemed to be going on so fast ourselves that the question might settle itself before a great while.

I said that I should be sorry to have that result happen before any action had been taken here; for, after it, we should scarcely attach value to would seem a mere form.

His lordship remarked that the insurrection had certainly been a very formidable one. It embraced a great territory and a numerous population. The very magnitude of the means used to suppress it proved its nature. Under these circumstances the government had sought to remain perfectly neutral. It would lean to neither side. The wishes of the federal authorities had been that it should aid them, which would have been a departure from that line of policy.

To this I replied, that, whatever might be the intent of that policy, the practical effect of it had been materially to uphold the rebels. The declaration of it at so early a moment, before the government had had any time to organize its counteracting forces, was a prejudgment of the whole question in their favor. The people of the United States felt as if the putting the two sides on an equality was in the nature of a standing insult to them. And the manifest eagerness of influential parties in Great Britain, to expedite all the means necessary to induce the misguided people to persevere in their undertaking was like the continual application of a nettle to flesh already raw.

His lordship then fell back upon the same argument to which he has resorted in his note to me of the 17th instant, in answer to my previous remonstrances against these movements, a copy of which goes out with this dispatch. He said that large supplies of similar materials had been obtained here on the part of the United States, which had been freely transported and effectively used against the insurgents.

I answered by admitting that at one time a quantity of arms and military stores had been purchased here as a purely commercial transaction for the use of the federal army; but that I had early objected to this practice, for the reason that it prevented me from pressing my remonstrances against a very different class of operations carried on by friends and sympathizers with the rebels in this island, and it had been discontinued. We had, indeed, purchased largely in Austria, but that government had never given any countenance to the insurgents.

His lordship observed that that government had no commercial interests pressing upon it for protection.

Here the conversation ceased. His lordship said that I had fully acquitted myself of my duty, and I took my leave.

There was another topic touched upon prior to the commencement of this one, to which I shall advert in another dispatch.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 149.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, May 22, 1862.

SIR: Your dispatches Nos. 147 to 150, both inclusive, have been received, and their contents respectively noted.

In my prior dispatches I have informed you fully of my suggestions to the government here as respects the propriety of withdrawing the concession of belligerent rights granted to the South, and of my purpose to await the development of a few days before mooted the question further. Your dispatch No. 149, subsequently received, and an unexpected interview with Mr. Thouvenel, under favorable circumstances, induced me to suggest it again.

I had a long conference with him on the 21st instant, and am fully satisfied that his previous answer given me on this question was upon advisement.

Immediately upon my entering his office, he said he had just received news from the United States; that the day preceding the secretary of their legation at Washington had arrived here, and they had a long talk about our affairs. He referred to our late successes, and the present position of our armies. He said he had never doubted the superior strength of the North, nor of its ability to overcome the South; but the question was, how were we to govern them afterwards? That under our form of government the assent of the people seemed to be *essential*. Putting his finger upon a map, and pointing to the central parts of the southern cotton States, he said that when beaten they would retire there; that it was a *vast country*, and consequently very difficult to foresee the future. I then recalled to him my former suggestion as to a withdrawal of the concession of belligerent rights as an act of justice to us, a friendly power, and a certain means of hastening the forthcoming of cotton to France. I pointed out to him on the large map received from your department the mode in which the insurrectionists were hemmed in without a port or outlet to the sea, with their cities taken, New Orleans and the Mississippi River in our possession, their feeble fleet in those waters destroyed, and with no ships or commerce anywhere. He said these things were true, and the concession of belligerent rights was therefore a nullity—mere waste paper; that it had been granted originally because it was supposed there would be an external as well as an internal war between the parties, and it would therefore be an essential to the commerce of France; that the concession was for a purpose external, not internal; but he repeated substantially what he had said on a prior occasion, that

it would not be a handsome thing in a great government at once, upon the South being worsted, to withdraw a concession which had been made to them in their day of supposed strength; that, aside from all political reasons, he *felt* that such a proceeding would not be exactly worthy of France; or, in common parlance, if I understood him aright, the thing would not look well. Besides, he said again, they could do nothing upon this subject without England; that they had acted together, and although there had been no treaty to that effect, yet France considered herself bound by this understanding. The answers to these suggestions seemed very obvious, and I, of course, used them. I told him that so far from this concession being regarded as of no importance by the insurrectionists, their resolutions to destroy their cotton, and not to plant another crop, were predicated altogether upon the hope that, in that event, necessity would yet drive these governments into alliance with them; that so long as this concession stood it was a hand extended, encouraging them to hope for more; that its prompt withdrawal at this time would end the rebellion at once. I further stated that this concession of belligerent rights was made in derogation of the sovereign powers of a friendly state, and under a mistaken view of facts, and it was but just to us that, upon the true state of the case appearing, it should be promptly withdrawn; that the acknowledgment by a foreign power of another flag within our sovereignty and jurisdiction was (aside from any practical effects) a matter which, of necessity, touched the pride and wounded the sensibilities of our people; that we first appealed to France to set this matter right, because we believed that France had wished us well. As respects England, with whom he said France must act, I told him that we could scarcely hope, in view of facts stated in your recent dispatches, that she would be willing to retrace her steps; that whatever might be the strictly official conduct of that government, we could scarcely forbear to see that it willfully closed its eyes to matters which were constantly being carried on in its ports. He said, in reply, he did not think we could justly charge anything of this kind upon France or her public men. * * * Mr. Thouvenel made no other answer to my remarks as to contraband goods going from here to the South than as heretofore stated. When, however, I told him of the subscriptions of £40,000 and £50,000 in Liverpool, and read to him a portion of your dispatch No. 146, in which it is stated that you have notice that five steamers have been purchased, fitted, armed, and supplied with material of war in England to prosecute a naval war against us, which could be looked upon as nothing less than a piratical invasion of our country, he seemed, I thought, somewhat incredulous. He said it was very strange, and that nothing of that kind, as I understood him, could be justified. I submitted to him whether it would not be well for France, under the circumstances, to signalize her aversion to the designs of such conspirators. He said he would speak to Lord Cowley on the subject. I have thus given you the substance of another conference upon these matters. I do not think these general conversations amount to much, except as showing the general drift of mind and purpose of the government. They are too loose in their nature to be otherwise regarded. Inasmuch as I had learned that Mr. Adams, in the exercise of the discretion which was left to him, had submitted your recent long dispatch giving a summary of our military position, in connection with the map which accompanied it, to the British government, I have done the same here.

With you, I feel the great importance of a withdrawal by these powers of this concession of belligerent rights; but, as I have written you from the beginning, I am confident that it will not be done in France except

in concert with England. This will remain true so long as the present cordial relations between these powers shall continue to exist. As you have access at Washington to the representatives of both, and may bring them into conference at your pleasure, cannot you obtain some suggestions from them favorable to such course of action? With aid from Mr. Mercier and Lord Lyons something may be done. Without such aid I fear it is not *at present* possible to accomplish anything in that direction.

I am, sir, your very obedient servant,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

No. 154.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, June 2, 1862.

SIR: Your dispatches Nos. 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 158, and 159 have been received.

No. 151, while acknowledging that France has faithfully practiced the neutrality she has proclaimed, again refers to the anxious desire felt for a withdrawal from the insurgents of the concession of belligerent rights, and dispatch No. 154 indirectly refers to the same thing. I have already informed you to what extent this point has been pressed upon the attention of the French government, and scarcely suppose you desire me, under existing circumstances, to go further. Indeed, after what has been said here, I do not see how it is possible to do so at present. I shall await some encouraging intimation from Mr. Adams of a change of purpose in England, or something from Mr. Mercier, through you, before I shall venture upon the question again, unless, in the meantime, I am otherwise directed. I repeat that it is in vain to hope that France, so long as the *entente cordiale* between the two countries continues to exist, will in this matter separate her policy from that of England.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

No. 163.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 3, 1862.

SIR: Your dispatch of May 16 (No. 147) has been submitted to the President.

You were wise in deferring further discussion with Mr. Thouvenel concerning the attitude held by France in regard to the civil war in this country, until the expectations which you had already submitted to him should have been measurably fulfilled. The discretion you thus exercised is approved, and you will exercise it again as to the time when you will submit what follows in this paper.

The capture of New Orleans, Yorktown, Norfolk, Pensacola, and Corinth, and the virtual removal of the blockade at Beaufort, Port Royal, and New Orleans, all which events have either occurred or become

known at Paris since your last reported communications with the French minister, have not only fulfilled all the promises you had at that time made, but they have also more than satisfied the desires which his government has, within the last eight months, so constantly but so courteously pressed upon the President's attention, while they are sufficient to dispel the last doubt of the preservation of the American Union which could be indulged by candid men.

Under such circumstances, the apprehension of any hostile intervention would be not less absurd on our part than unjust and ungenerous towards France. So, also, the attitude of neutrality, so solemnly proclaimed by the Emperor a year ago, is fast resolving itself into an abstraction, in view of the fact that, virtually, there is no longer any field, on land or water, where conflict with this government can be raised by the rebels in the presence of a foreign power.

The President, however, is not less anxious now than heretofore that the posture of the French government may be modified. The Emperor of France has not thought it unbecoming to expose to us the exigencies of his own country, resulting from this unhappy contest. It cannot be improper, on our part, to allude to the susceptibilities of the American people. Our prestige has been impaired by our divisions, and we have consequently encountered indifference, coldness, and, as we think, injustice and injury, in our foreign relations. When we remember that we are a democratic power, that for many years we were a leading democratic state, and that the security of the constitutional republican system in other countries where it has been established has been everywhere thought dependent on its success here, it is not to be wondered at if we think that whatever wrong it committed against us, in the crisis through which we are passing, is a wrong suffered by us in the cause of freedom and humanity, with which we are always accustomed to identify republican institutions. We are, indeed, on the eve of domestic peace, but we have a deep interest in establishing that peace upon the firmest foundations and rendering it universal. The empire of France rests upon a democratic basis. The monarch himself has declared that that empire is peace. We think, therefore, that he will agree with us in the desire that whatever has anywhere occurred, during our present conflict, to produce feelings of distrust or alienation between the United States and foreign countries, shall be seasonably corrected, in order that no such sentiments shall survive.

It is a maxim of international intercourse that no government can rightfully recognize insurgents against another as lawful belligerents, except when the state of the contest is such as to raise the probability of a successful revolution. If a recognition based on the assumption of such a probability has at any time been made, it ought to be rescinded when the probability has failed. Does any one expect that a sovereign nation can be organized by the insurrectionary States of the south, while the United States possess the Mississippi River, its tributaries, and its mouths, and virtually possess, also, all the navigable lakes and rivers of the country, as well those of the coast as those which are inland, together with the political capital and all the centers of manufacturing industry and commercial exchange? Does any one expect that the insurgents without a single ship of war or a place in which to launch one, or funds with which to build it, with an army demoralized, a prostrate credit, and a country exhausted of its wealth and resources, will be able to change the military position I have described?

It is a palpable fact that the movers of this insurrection never entertained any expectation of achieving a revolution. What they did desire

and hope was to open a point for foreign intervention, upon which they have relied to effect the overthrow of the Union. They were shrewd men, and therefore could not have entirely miscalculated the conflicting forces. They began intrigues for intervention even before they ventured upon rebellion, and they have plied those intrigues with more assiduity and energy than they have the work of revolution. In these intrigues they have used bribes and threats as they esteemed the conditions and characters of foreign states. Their pretended revolution was, therefore, a fraud against mankind. The toleration which they received abroad, in the beginning of the strife, may be excused upon the ground of the skill with which they practiced the imposture. But now, when it has been so fully exposed and exploded, that toleration may justly be expected to be withdrawn.

But our representations made to that end are met by a new form of argument based on the assumed desperation of the insurgents. We are told that although everywhere defeated, the people of the insurrectionary region will not submit; that they are determined to carry on the war; that the belligerents will withdraw from the reach of our navy on the coasts, and the banks of rivers and lakes; that they will destroy all productions and merchandise which they cannot remove; that they will leave federal garrisons in their cities a prey to pestilence, and will resort to inland positions inaccessible to the federal armies, and direct from such positions a relentless guerrilla war of indefinite duration.

We might give the fullest credence to these representations of the insurgents, and then we might say that a campaign conducted upon the principles thus announced would have no tendency whatever to exhaust the strength or resources of this government. Resistance in such a case would cost far less of life and treasure than the nation is now expending. But I do not dwell on this point.

I prefer to ask on what ground is it that a faction thus waging intestine war against the government of our country, equally without cause and without hope, could ask to be regarded by friendly states as a lawful belligerent? To regard them in that light would be to subvert maxims of the law of nations universally accepted. It would be nothing less than to make every state an insidious enemy to the peace of every other state in the civilized world, and with the ultimate consequence of general war among all nations. But these menaces are ineffectual and harmless. They assume a condition of public sentiment in the revolutionary states which has no existence. Wherever the Union forces have advanced they have found a sentiment of loyalty manifesting itself just in the degree that confidence in the ability of the federal government to guarantee the safety of the citizen was restored. This has been the case in the District of Columbia, and in the States of Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri, Virginia, Tennessee, North Carolina, Alabama, Arkansas, and Florida. The federal government has either maintained or resumed its functions in the whole or parts of all the insurrectionary communities. There is no subjugation proposed, nor is there any necessary. The federal government has only limited functions to perform, and every community in which it exercises them is, by the very terms of the Constitution, left to exercise self-government in all matters of municipal concern.

The insurgents do not withdraw; on the contrary, they are driven from the coasts, banks, and shores. Their commands for the destruction of cotton and other valuables fail to be obeyed as soon as their presence is withdrawn. No one fears that the pestilence will obey their summons, and follow their direction in the pursuit of victims. There are no places inaccessible to the federal army and navy, save in the mountainous

districts, and there the people, if not altogether loyal, are at least divided. The guerrilla war which they threaten must therefore be a social war, confined to portions of the insurrectionary States, leaving the loyal States in the enjoyment of profound peace. But guerrilla soldiery, like all other, must have arms, ammunition, and supplies, and for these they must depend upon labor, and in this case upon slave labor. Slaves desert their occupations, and even cast off their bondage, just as rapidly as this civil war approaches them. Troops of them are encountered on all the highways, and the federal camps everywhere are crowded with them. Agents of foreign governments are awaiting here to receive them at our hands. Either the insurgents must allow their slaves to escape with impunity, or must prevent them by force. The attempt at prevention converts the civil war at once into a servile war. Thus, instead of inaugurating a guerrilla war, the insurgents are preparing for themselves the most destructive scourge ever experienced among men.

These facts are calculated to awaken the most serious thought. The reflections they suggest concern the highest interests of nations, and reach the noblest springs of human action. I forbear from giving them an application to the merely ephemeral interests of my own country or of France.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extracts.]

No. 272.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, June 9, 1862.

SIR: Your dispatch of May 22 (No. 164) has been submitted to the President. He regrets that her Majesty's government does not deem it important to reconsider its attitude towards the United States.

* * * * *

The condition of our relations with maritime powers is becoming a subject of popular debate, and is likely to be agitated in the House of Representatives. It is impossible here to understand the policy by which the British government is persuaded that the sensibilities of this country, upon the subject of its sovereignty and true independence, in such a crisis as this, are wisely disregarded.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCOIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

No. 167.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, June 20, 1862.

SIR: Your dispatch of June 2 (No. 154) has been received. While the President regrets that, in your opinion, there is no immediate prospect of success in inducing the government of France to rescind the declara-

tion of neutrality which it adopted last year, he does not at all doubt the fidelity and earnestness with which you have presented the subject; and he has intended to leave, as he still leaves, the prosecution of that object to your own discretion, in which he reposes the utmost confidence.

A change of position by the maritime powers is, in his judgment, essential to an early and complete restoration of commerce between this country and Europe. But the interest of those powers in that restoration is now fully as great as our own. Having submitted our convictions with frankness, and enforced them with arguments derived from a full knowledge of the condition of things in this country, we can now cheerfully leave the subject to the consideration of parties so deeply interested.

It is proper, however, that you should understand that the British and French governments do not at all hesitate to suggest to us continual modifications of a blockade, unquestionably lawful in all respects, with a view to facilitate their acquisition of cotton, while the concessions already made seem to the President to entitle us to the exercise of some reciprocal liberality on their part.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

[Extract.]

No. 178.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 10, 1862.

SIR: * * * * *

We have heard and redressed every injury of which any foreign state has complained, and we have relaxed a blockade in favor of foreign commerce that we might rightfully have maintained with inflexibility. We have only complained because an attitude of neutrality, encouraging to rebellion among us, adopted hastily and unnecessarily, has not been relinquished when the progress of the war showed that it was as injurious as it was ill-advised.

* * * * *

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extracts.]

No. 303.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 18, 1862.

SIR: * * * * *

All our efforts are measurably counteracted by the attitude of those governments which recognize our internal enemy as a lawful public beligerent, and thereby are understood as encouraging it to hope for recognition and intervention. Those efforts are counteracted also by an illicit British trade, which supplies that enemy with ships of war, arms, am-

munition, supplies, and credit. And still more are they counteracted by the now conceded political sympathies of European masses and classes, who improve the civil war in this country and the distresses it works to the manufacturing and commercial interests of their own countries to raise against us there a prejudice which has the moral effect of sustaining and prolonging that civil war.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 195.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,

Paris, September 13, 1862.

SIR: There have been such frequent references, in the English as well as the American journals, to conferences between Mr. Slidell and Mr. Thouvenel, that I began to think that there might be something important which I should know but I did not. In a conversation, therefore, of some length, had with Mr. Thouvenel yesterday, I referred to the subject. I stated that he might have observed I had not for some time past referred to Mr. Slidell, or the efforts at this court of the emissaries of the South; that I had avoided it because, as I understood, they had no official relations with the French court. To this he assented. I then stated generally, that if any propositions or suggestions had come or should come, from any source, affecting the interests of the United States, and which should be entertained or considered by the French government, I should be thankful to him if he would let me know what they were, that I might make such suggestions as might be necessary. I did this because I had seen it distinctly stated that certain suggestions or propositions as to the modification of slavery in the South had been made and recently renewed, and I felt that if such unofficial suggestions or propositions, which I could not strictly inquire about, were entertained by the government, we were in a worse position in this respect than if these emissaries had been duly accredited and received. Mr. Thouvenel, without giving a direct answer to my suggestions, immediately said that he had seen Mr. Slidell once, when he arrived in Paris, about which we knew everything; that afterwards, about the time that Mr. Mason last applied to Earl Russell, and for a like purpose, Mr. Slidell applied to him; that these were the only occasions upon which he had seen Mr. Slidell, and he much doubted if the latter felt greatly flattered by his reception. He said he was quite sure that Mr. Slidell was satisfied that his arguments had failed to convince him (Mr. Thouvenel) of the propriety of recognizing the South; that the argument of Mr. Slidell for recognition was precisely that which we had used for a withdrawal of a concession of belligerent rights—to wit, that it would “end the war;” that there might be some writing or negotiation afterwards, but that a recognition by France would substantially end the war! He added that he did not believe that Mr. Slidell had ever written to his government all that he (Mr. Thouvenel) said to him on the subject. He furthermore said that Mr. De Leon, ex-consul, &c., (author of a southern pamphlet published here,) and whom he seemed to consider

as another southern agent now here, he had never seen at all. The pamphlet then lay on his table. He added that I knew well his sympathies and his acts had been with us from the beginning. This, I am satisfied, has been so. You may have remarked in times past that the subject of slavery, the causes of the rebellion, or the right of secession, have not been in our conferences a subject of general discussion. The truth is, no occasion has arisen to make such discussion needful or proper. I have always been satisfied that Mr. Thouvenel's views on the subject were right. He knows, and perfectly appreciates the fact that slavery lies at the basis of the insurrection; that it is not free trade, nor any other of the pretexts or political pretenses which are put forth by southern emissaries, that have led to this state of things. I only wish he was as well satisfied of our power to suppress the insurrection as I believe him to be satisfied of our right to do so.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 359.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, September 26, 1862.

SIR:

In the beginning of our domestic troubles, all the outside world was apparently in a state of profound and permanent peace. It seemed as if, unavoidably, irritation was produced in several foreign countries by the derangement of our national commerce, and they were not only entirely free to combine against us and enforce a dissolution of the Union, but were even being impelled by very powerful influences to enter into such a combination. Perhaps the most portentous incident which has occurred in the progress of this unhappy strife was the announcement made to us by the governments of Great Britain and France that they had agreed to act together in regard to the questions which it should present for their consideration. Every one knows the influence that the united wills of these two great maritime powers carry in the councils of other states. It has been for us of late a relief to perceive that although European cabinets still maintain their conventional accord, yet the fundamental political interests of the states they represent are forcing themselves into notice and tempering, if not modifying, the proceedings of their governments.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCOIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 373.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, October 20, 1862.

SIR: Your dispatch of October 3 (No. 230) has been received. Your proceeding in presenting to her Majesty's government a remonstrance

against the practices of British subjects in arming and fitting out privateers to depredate on American commerce is approved by the President. The language and the effect of your remonstrance are equally satisfactory. When at the close of the last session of Congress it was proposed here to issue letters of marque for the protection of our commerce against such depredations by the insurgents, the proposition was relinquished on the ground that they had no ports here within control from which piratical cruisers could be sent out, and it was not apprehended that the shores of Great Britain would be suffered to be used by them for a base of operations. Yet we now see a piratical vessel built, manned, armed, equipped, and dispatched from a British port, and roaming at large on the seas, without even touching the American shores, destroying American merchantmen as if there were no treaties between Great Britain and the United States, while entrance into British ports for coals and other supplies is denied to our national armed vessels under a proclamation of neutrality. This is one of the lamentable fruits of the policy which Great Britain adopted at the beginning of the war, without previous consultation with the United States, and has persisted in ever since in opposition to their earnest and persevering remonstrances. Our agents are reporting to us new and larger military and naval preparations in British ports, and if they are to be allowed to go on to their conclusion, and to operate, as has been done in the case of the *Tro*, will not the result be that, while Great Britain avows neutrality, her subjects are practically allies of the internal enemies of the United States? The President will not consent to believe that her Britannic Majesty's government would willingly allow a condition of affairs to occur which would seem to leave to the United States almost no hope of remaining at peace with Great Britain without sacrifices for which no peace could ever compensate.

The Secretary of the Navy is adopting all possible means to meet the new exigency which has occurred.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 418.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, December 8, 1862.

SIR: * * *

I notice in the communication of Earl Russell the appearance rather than the expression of a belief that the United States are more tolerant of real or apparent injury from France than of such injury coming from Great Britain, and that they would prefer rather the friendship of the former than of the latter country. Perhaps a word or two on this subject may not now be out of season. Beyond all doubt the people of the United States desire peace and friendship with both of those powers. A traditional sympathy with France has come down to us from the revolutionary age. It has not, however, been strong enough for many years past to persuade the American people to bear with patience any aggression that France might commit. On the other hand, two wars with Great Britain have left memories that are impatient. But the growing

intercourse between the two countries has counteracted those memories, so that the people would not willingly do Great Britain any wrong, but, on the other hand, they are in a temper to become fast friends. The joint proceedings of the two countries in regard to this war have neutralized those national sentiments in a large degree. Our commerce has suffered, and our armies have been hindered by actual co-operation of British subjects with the insurgents, while no considerable grievances of that kind have been inflicted upon us by France. I do not profess to know, nor do I care to inquire, whether the French press and the French statesmen have been as intolerant towards us as the British press and the British statesmen. It is enough that the latter speak and print in our own tongue, and everybody on this side of the Atlantic reads and hears them. The French employ a different language, and, practically, are not read and heard in our country. The people have hitherto been jealous and watchful of both Great Britain and France, because the language and the proceedings of each were not as forbearing, or, if it would suit them better, I would say not so generous, as was expected, and because there was a prevailing consciousness on our part that we were not yet fully prepared for a foreign war. This latter conviction is passing away. It is now apparent to observing and considerate men that no European state is as really capable to do us harm as we are capable to defend ourselves. There is, moreover, a general conviction that we have deserved peace and friendship at the hands of all nations, and that if war must come from any foreign quarter, our cause will be a just one, and such a war would rather strengthen the Union than add to its present dangers. The time, therefore, is a propitious one for the restoration of harmonious relations between the United States and Great Britain. It will be through her own fault, not ours, if the restoration does not come. All that stands in the way of it is the injurious attitude of armed neutrality between the United States and a domestic faction that is seeking their overthrow—a neutrality that, as we think, was unnecessarily proclaimed, and has resulted in making British ports a base for a feeble yet irritating and vexatious maritime war against this country. British ships and even fleets ride in our ports free, honored, and respected. Armed vessels of the United States are allowed only restricted entrance, with irritating conditions, in British ports, colonial as well as domestic, when they are sent to watch the appearance of privately armed hostile expeditions sent out from those ports by or through the activity of British subjects—an activity which, although forbidden, is nevertheless practiced with impunity, and in defiance of municipal law as well as international justice. It no longer rests with this country to suggest remedies for this evil. All that could be suggested on that subject has been offered and reiterated. The whole case may be summed up in this: The United States claim, and they must continually claim, that in this war they are a whole sovereign nation, and entitled to the same respect as such that they accord to Great Britain. Great Britain does not treat them as such a sovereign, and hence all the evils that disturb their intercourse and endanger their friendship. Great Britain justifies her course and persecutors. The United States do not admit the justification, and so they are obliged to complain and stand upon their guard. Those in either country who desire to see the two nations remain in this relation are not well-advised friends of either of them.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extracts.]

No. 355.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, March 26, 1863.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit to you copies of the Daily News and the Morning Post, of the 24th instant, containing a report of the speeches made in the House of Lords the previous evening on American affairs.

The reply of Lord Russell will doubtless attract much more of your attention. I think it, in spirit, the most satisfactory of all the speeches he has made since I have been at this post. Had he commenced in the same tone in May, 1861, when I arrived, things would have been now in a much more satisfactory state between the two countries than they are. The fact that not a word more was uttered in an assembly not less than four-fifths of whom may be fairly regarded as no well-wishers to anything American is not without significance. In this connection it may be advisable for you to glance at the comments made on this debate by the London Times of the following morning. It will not escape your observation that the question is now felt to be taking a shape which was scarcely anticipated by the managers when they first undertook to guide the British mind to the overthrow of free institutions in America.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

[For speech referred to see Parliamentary and Judicial Appendix, No. 4.]

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

[Extract.]

No. 336.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 24, 1863.

SIR:

It gives me great pleasure to acknowledge that, beyond what we deem the original error of France in recognizing, unnecessarily, as we think, the insurgents as a belligerent, we have every reason to appreciate the just and impartial observance of neutrality which has been practiced in the ports and harbors of France by the government of the Emperor. In any case it will be hereafter, as it has been heretofore, a pleasing duty to conduct all our belligerent proceedings so as to inflict no wrong or injury upon the government or the people of the French empire.

You have also done the country a good service in explaining, in your conversations with Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys, the manner in which we have heretofore maintained our neutrality in foreign wars, by enforcing our enlistment laws, which are in all respects the same as those of Great Britain.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seaward to Mr. Adams.

No. 669.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 30, 1863.

SIR: I have your dispatch of the 16th of July, (No. 452,) which informs me of Mr. Roebuck's withdrawal of his motion for a recognition of the insurgents on the 13th instant. A careful observation of events as they were transpiring in Great Britain had prepared us for this result.

The concurrence of many important incidents entitles us to regard the present hour as a crisis of our civil war. The campaign in Virginia, Ohio, Tennessee, Mississippi, and Louisiana, although it had been well matured, and was prosecuted with great assiduity and unsurpassed heroism, was nevertheless attended, until recently, by discouraging delays, reverses, and disasters. The insurgents had gotten up with much skill and energy a loan abroad, based on an assumption of their eventual success, which seemed to promise them an available and durable credit in the European market. This achievement enabled them to employ, without stint, many artificers of Great Britain, and some other countries, in furnishing all the materials and machinery of land and naval warfare, while they threatened to constrain the world's manufactures into an advocacy of their sovereignty and independence. Successes like those procured for them political agencies in France and Great Britain, which, repressing the national sentiments of those countries, and stifling even their sympathies with the cause of progress and humanity in Europe as well as in America, made it seem for a time, at least, probable that the two powers which are the most dominating, and therefore the most interested in the stability of this nation, with its free government and liberal institutions, would combine to overthrow, devastate, and destroy whatever of government, commerce, and culture had been created on this continent. The conspiracy against our country, which thus flourished apparently unchecked in so many of the slave States, and which had effected such startling combinations in Europe, borrowed aid which cannot be condemned or deplored too much from interests in the loyal States that counselled the obtaining of peace, indolence, personal exemptions and partisan advantages at the imminent hazard, if not at the certain cost, of even a dissolution of the Union, and a surrender as well of the liberties of the country as of its hitherto supposed well-assured and beneficent destiny. This concurrence of signs, favorable to the success of the insurrection, raised the hopes of its authors to a state of presumption. They broke and trampled upon the cartels of military exchanges, defied and despised well-prepared assaults, set on foot invasions of the loyal States, and demanded passage and admission for a representative, on equivocal pretenses, at Washington. Such audacity is of itself, for a season, and in favorable circumstances, no contemptible element of political force.

But the imposing fabric of insurgent expectations has been suddenly shattered. The campaigns, so long unsuccessful, have culminated in victories which, as a whole, are as demonstrative and fruitful as, perhaps, ever attended any combination of military and naval movements when the theater was a continent. The basis has fallen out of their fiscal system. Their pretended securities sell at the rate of nine cents on the dollar at home, where, at last, their value abroad must always be ascertained. The insurgents must hereafter base their claims on foreign nations for material and capital—not, as heretofore, upon promises of speculative profit, but upon the charity of contributors. France and Great Britain,

relieved of artificial and exaggerated importunities, will have abundant leisure to consider the morality and justice of recognition, as well as the possible dangers and evils which may attend the attempt to renew European domination on a continent that, with very opposite ideas of government and social sentiments, is rapidly advancing to an equality in population, wealth, and power with Europe itself. It begins to be seen that, although, like every other country, the United States are not exempt from faction, yet, the people need only to see and to realize any new national danger, and time to measure the amount of sacrifices required, to avert it. When they have done this, the last sacrifices are as cheerfully made as the first. Arrogance, menace, and military severity on the part of the insurgents have given place to spasmodic demands for new and final levies of men and money, now discovered to be essential for mere self-defense.

What is the instruction of this crisis? I do not forget that war, especially civil war, is capricious. I know very well that the rainbow, which appears when the clouds have parted, is not always a sure sign that even worse tempests are not gathering in the political skies. Nevertheless we must act upon such indications as Providence is pleased to favor us with, always applying to them the test of experience. One of the instructions of experience is, that, usually, a short and convulsive life is appointed to factions, while nations, like individuals, though obliged to encounter many successive and fearful dangers, are yet created to endure and fulfill great ends. So we regard the present stage of this contest as reassuring us of the ultimate deliverance of the country, and the salvation, in their full extent, of its territory and its free institutions.

At the moment, however, when we are accepting this satisfactory view, we find that we are drifting, notwithstanding our most earnest and vigorous resistance, towards a war with Great Britain. Our commerce on the high seas is perishing under the devastation of ships of war that are sent out for that purpose from British coasts, by British subjects, and we hear of new corsairs and more formidable armaments of that kind, designed even to dislodge us from the military occupation of insurgent ports and to burn and destroy our principal cities, and these armaments, it is represented to us by imposing British authorities, the government of Great Britain is not authorized by the laws of the realm to restrain. It cannot be deemed offensive to say that at any period of our history when we were not suffering from intestine war, these injuries would not have been borne. At least it is true that they were not attempted until we were seen to have fallen upon the calamities of civil war. Great Britain might ask herself whether, if a similar opportunity for such hostilities should offer, she would consent to bear like assaults upon her commerce and her sovereignty. I know no one point of political calculation more certain than this, that just what the people of Great Britain would do, under defined circumstances, in self-defense, that is what, under the same circumstances, the people in whose name I am writing must and will do in their own defense.

I would, if properly I could, shut out from consideration another element which enters into the case. Great Britain has at no time intimated that, even with the co-operation of France, she would adopt or sanction a war or a hostile policy against the United States. Her government has on apt occasions indicated a very different and much more just disposition. We respect the government and people of Great Britain for her persistence in these indications. Nevertheless we have the personal authority of the Emperor of the French for the fact that he has announced to Great Britain that he is willing to follow, if Great Britain will decide

to lead the way, in recognizing the insurgents. To give such a recognition, under the circumstances, would be to them a demonstration more potential than a fleet or an army, while it would authoritatively sanction the piratical enterprises of British subjects, which, even when disavowed by Great Britain, are proving intolerable to the United States. At the same time it is to be observed that Great Britain as well as France has been explicitly informed by the United States that a recognition of the insurgents would necessarily be deemed by them an unfriendly proceeding. Virtually, therefore, France invites Great Britain to an alliance offensive and injurious to the United States. Judging with the light which falls upon our position, such an alliance would be morally wrong; for of what crime against both or either of these two nations, or against any nation, are the United States accused? What unatoned wrong have they done which France and Great Britain are entitled by the law of nations to redress? The United States have fallen, not without forty years of protracted resistance, into a state of civil war, which is an inconvenience to other maritime and commercial powers. Has either Great Britain or France, or any other nation, sinned less against the peace of the world than the United States? If ever a nation could plead successfully the irrepressibility of the elements of a civil strife, it is the United States on this occasion. World-planted and cherished, African slavery here has audaciously risen up to overthrow a government, the most equal and just that has ever been established among men, and to erect a new one exclusively upon the basis of human bondage. The United States refuse to be destroyed or divided by such an agency for such a purpose. It is not easy, on this side of the Atlantic, to conceive how such a civil war can be looked upon with favor, or even with indifference, in Europe. We have, nevertheless, accepted the fact that Great Britain and France do regard this insurrection with favor, on the demand of the statesmen and presses which seem most to engage the confidence of the people in those countries. France now requires us to go one step further and to accept the fact that Great Britain and herself ought to vote for the admission of the insurgents into the family of nations. The ground upon which the Emperor favors that extraordinary proceeding is, that it is expected that it would tend to bring our unhappy civil war to a close. His Imperial Majesty seems, to me, to have widely misconstrued the character of the American people. They are a brave and a jealous people; they have made it their chief duty, throughout a whole century, to achieve a national independence and acquire a continental influence, just like that which France and Great Britain have respectively won through the conflicts of eight centuries. The people of the United States undoubtedly desire peace, but they would neither accept a peace that the proposed combination would offer them, nor acquiesce in it if it were possible to force it upon them. European powers can dictate peace, even to Asiatic communities, only by subjugating them, and yet they have been undergoing the process of moral decline since the era of Alexander. American society, on the contrary, is in the full vigor of youth; it is too enlightened not to resist extirpation or aggression by foreign powers. I forbear from pressing the consideration that such a proceeding to enforce peace, in the United States, would be immoral, or the consideration that acceptance of a peace thus compelled would be suicidal. Those who should be prepared for an attempt either to subjugate the United States by force or to divide and separate them by foreign influence, could not be expected to apprehend the sensibilities and the sentiments which prevail among the people whom it is proposed in that extraordinary way to pacify.

Certainly, however, it behooves all the parties concerned to consider what probably will be the consequences to themselves if the intemperate action of British subjects and the inducement of French alliance shall bring on a war between Great Britain and France and the United States. Suppose it to result in the success of the allies? I have already said that no peace accepted at their hands could endure. Are the allies strong enough to garrison the American continent? Will they ever be prepared to guarantee the new slave State, and to hold its ambition for territory and its cupidity for slaves within bounds? And what are the bounds to be prescribed? Shall that new slave State be allowed to extend slavery and dominion only throughout the present territory of the United States, or are the anomalous and hateful institutions to be restored in Mexico and throughout Spanish America, including the West India Islands? It has required a term of fifty years and the co-operating power of the United States to arrest the African slave trade. How do the supposed allies now expect to prevent its renewal when the United States shall have relapsed into accompliceship with that dreadful traffic? Or is the arrested work of Christianizing Africa, through the missionary enginery of the Middle Passage, to be renewed and carried on to its consummation under the auspices of the supposed allies?

Prudent states, even though strohg in mutual alliance, must, nevertheless, always take into consideration all the chances of success and failure. Let us suppose, then, that the allies shall not succeed in their enterprise, and that the United States shall come unharned out of the contest. Would there be nothing to apprehend from the temper of a people who had been, as it would then seem, wantonly brought into national conflict on no other pretext than their unwillingness to surrender up their sovereignty and independence? Is there any possession or any interest of France or of Great Britain, domestic or colonial, that would be the better assured to its lawful sovereign after such a war than it has been heretofore assured, through the justice and forbearance of the United States, so long as they had constituted a nation?

There is, moreover, a moral opinion that pervades the world, and when it is excited it works marvelous things in the policy of peoples and states. The universal revolution towards popular forms of government received, from the war in which that system was inaugurated here, an impulse which long continued to force it forward, through unheard of convulsions in Europe, and which impelled it into triumphant success throughout this continent. Those who contemplate an alliance by European monarchical states against the United States may be reasonably expected to consider how long and how far the aggressive governments are likely to be willingly supplied with men and the materials for a war that will be deemed to be waged for the suppression of popular institutions.

Alliances may, indeed, be made by monarchs and statesmen; but, after all, they must depend for support and continuance upon the allied peoples and nations themselves. France and Great Britain are now equals. Alliance between a weak state and a strong one has sometimes been preserved through several generations, when the states were separate and remote; but I think there has been no case in which a voluntary alliance has permanently held two equal independent states through a long war without producing in one or in both of them changes that, had they been foreseen, would have been sufficient, by way of warning, to prevent the formation of the alliance. The statesmen of France and of Great Britain, if the project of an alliance were indeed seriously entertained, could not, I think, begin too soon to study how the expenses and the losses, and

the profits and benefits, which must attend or follow it, shall be equitably allotted between the two countries.

I have thus surveyed not only our domestic situation, but also the entire position of our relations with the chief maritime powers, not because it is seriously apprehended here that either alone, or in alliance with France, Great Britain is now about to adopt the injurious and unfriendly measure which the Emperor of France has indicated, but because the survey furnishes a basis for the renewal, under the President's instructions, of a suggestion which has for some time been held in abeyance—namely, that all the misunderstandings which have arisen between the United States and Great Britain, including those which now seem to be causing the two countries to be drifting towards a conflict which must be calamitous, are due to the premature recognition of the insurgents as a belligerent power, and that two years of experience have confirmed the wisdom and the justice of the protest that this government made against that extraordinary proceeding. The insurrection, notwithstanding the incalculable benefits it has received from that most unfortunate measure, has, nevertheless, languished from the very beginning, and has now descended so low that manifestly it would perish at once, if it were left like the late insurrection in India, like the insurrection which a few years ago occurred in Canada, like the chronic insurrections in Spanish America, or even like the insurrection now raging in Poland, to stand by means of its own strength, not as a recognized belligerent, but as a domestic party, aiming to revolutionize the government that it refuses to obey. I know how difficult it would be for the government of Great Britain all at once to reverse the policy of which we have never ceased to complain, even though it might be conceded that that policy had been unnecessarily adopted. But every new demand that is made upon that government for toleration of designs hostile to the United States relates back to the premature recognition of the insurgents as a belligerent, and strains to convert it into not merely a recognition of their sovereignty, but into actual war against the United States. Recurring to the sentiments which the President expressed in the beginning of these unhappy troubles, I am authorized to tender to Great Britain assurances of the desire of the United States for the removal of every cause of alienation, and for the re-establishment of the relations between them on the foundations of common interest and of affections and sympathies which, if left unopposed, would hold them together in the bonds of enduring friendship. We invite her to weigh these advantages against the promised benefits of any hostile alliance that she can form against us. We are yet friends, though that friendship has been severely tried. If we must become enemies, the responsibility of that unhappy and fearful event will rest on her Majesty's government and the people of Great Britain.

It is not intended that you shall formally communicate the contents of this paper to Earl Russell, but that you will use its suggestions and arguments in your own discretion if circumstances shall seem to you to require or to favor the introduction of the serious topics which I have thus discussed.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Lord Lyons.

[Extracts.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, August 4, 1863.

The undersigned, Secretary of State of the United States, has the honor to acknowledge the reception of the note which was addressed to him by Lord Lyons, on the 1st of August instant, concerning the case of the steamer *General Rusk*, *alias* the *Blanche*.

* * * * *

The *General Rusk* was notoriously an American vessel, and it is not satisfactorily shown in the case that the title in her has ever been, in good faith, lawfully vested in any subject of Great Britain. At the same time, it is hardly necessary for the undersigned to remark that the United States have never assented to the fact her Majesty's government assumes, namely, that the insurgents are a lawful belligerent, and consequently the United States insist that, as between those insurgents and the United States, all such proceedings of their pretended authorities are simply illegal and void.

* * * * *

The undersigned avails himself of this opportunity to renew to Lord Lyons the assurance of his high consideration.

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

Right Hon. LORD LYONS.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 676.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, August 10, 1863.

SIR: Your dispatch, of the 23d of July, No. 456, was duly received. Your comments upon the condition of public sentiment in Great Britain would, if published, find a universal response in this country. But whither is the animosity against the United States, which inspires a class of Englishmen, leading England? They have, indeed, been gratified with seeing the prestige of this country, at least for a time, abridged. But has England yet gained a square mile of territory, or has she extended or augmented her great influence a hair's breadth, through the humiliation we have brought on ourselves by the divisions which Englishmen seek to perpetuate and widen? Spain occupies a province which perhaps she might not have claimed if our country had remained at peace, and France has sent a column to Mexico since the United States became embarrassed by civil war. But England has no part in these European acquisitions on this continent. Has the voice of England become more commanding in Western Europe, or in China, or Japan, since she has been made to appear an enemy of the United States? I think that it is not on her word that the peace of the world is supposed to be depending. What, indeed, is the American quarrel which already divides the voices though not yet the votes of England, but a civil war in the universal commonwealth of the British races? Great Britain has not yet been actively concerned by American dissensions, but if we might discuss her policy as freely as her statesmen discuss our own, I think I might safely say that she does not feel a surer confidence in preserving the integrity of her great empire than we do in maintaining unbroken the large but more compact and pro-

ductive one which has been committed to our care. The people of Great Britain thought more dispassionately and acted more wisely in cultivating the friendship of the United States three years ago than they do now in crowding upon the line where prejudice rises into alienation. We must, nevertheless, accept the actual situation. Perhaps it is appointed for needful discipline to both branches of the British family. When that discipline shall have been fully realized, the records of your legation will show that it was not the United States which in this instance misunderstood the interests of the great race, or were unfaithful to the instincts which should have preserved them in full force for the benefits of civilization.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Circular No. 39.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, August 12, 1863.

SIR: Whenever the United States have complained of the premature decrees of Great Britain and France, which accorded the character of a belligerent to the insurgents, the statesmen of those countries have answered, that from the first they agreed in opinion that the efforts of the government to maintain the Union, and preserve the integrity of the republic, could not be successful. With a view to correct this prejudice of so vital a question, I addressed a circular letter to the representatives of the United States in foreign countries on the 14th day of April, 1862, in which I reviewed the operations of the war on sea and land, and presented the results which had attended it down to that period. The prejudice which I then attempted to remove still remains, and it constitutes the basis of all that is designedly or undesignedly injurious to this country in the policy of foreign nations. The insurgents have been enabled to protract their resistance by means of sympathy and aid they have received from abroad, and the expectation of further and more effective foreign assistance is now their chief resource. A new effort, therefore, to correct that prejudice is demanded equally by a prudent concern for our foreign relations, and by the paramount interests of peace and humanity at home.

[Mr. Seward then gives a lengthy review of military operations, and of the progress made in suppressing the rebellion, and concludes:]

You will use the facts presented in this paper in such a way as may be most effective to convince those who seek a renewal of commercial prosperity through the restoration of peace in America, that the quickest and shortest way to gain that desirable end is to withdraw support and favor from the insurgents, and to leave the adjustment of our domestic controversies exclusively with the people of the United States.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 729.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, October 5, 1863.

SIR :

The proclamation of neutrality was a concession of belligerent rights to the insurgents, and was deemed by this government as unnecessary and in effect as unfriendly, as it has since proved injurious to this country.

The successive preparations of hostile naval expeditions in Great Britain are regarded here as fruits of that injudicious proclamation.

Earl Russell adds that the United States have derived some military supplies from Great Britain, and enlisted many British subjects in their cause. But it can hardly be denied that neither such supplies nor such men would have been necessary if Great Britain had not, so far as she was concerned, first raised the insurgents to the position of belligerents.

It is hardly necessary to say that the United States stand upon what they think impregnable ground when they refuse to be derogated, by any act of the British government, from their position as a sovereign nation in amity with Great Britain, and placed upon a footing of equality with domestic insurgents, who have risen up in resistance against their authority.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &co., &co., &co.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 762.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 17, 1863.

SIR: Your dispatch of October 29 (No. 526) has been received. I thank you for the newspaper debates which you have furnished me on the subject of the armed naval expeditions prepared in British ports.

I think you have rightly derived the existing embarrassments of the British government in regard to our affairs from the one cause—the error of investing the insurgents with a belligerent character.

The latest incidents disclose that the insurgents, so long tolerated and practically cherished within the realm, have at last, by natural consequence, had the hardihood to organize in the British provinces, adjacent to our ports, with design for a border campaign. It seems surprising that they have not earlier made this attempt. The Canadian authorities, desirous of peace and beneficial commerce with us, have not been slow to discover the duties devolved upon them by comity and international law, and they have acted promptly and effectively in fulfilling those obligations. Her Majesty's government cannot fail, I think, to approve of this course, because it is conservative of their transatlantic empire. It seems to me, also, that they cannot easily undervalue the good faith and candor of this government in its proceedings in regard to this new class of embarrassments. It is certain that in such attempts

as the insurgents are so audaciously making in Canada we might look for occasions of offense, if we were disposed to be aggressive or unfriendly to Great Britain. We shall probably pass through the present difficulties easily, but other plots will follow. Certainly the insurgents are inventive, bold, and enterprising. Their schemes are suggestive. They have failed because of deficiency of material power and moral strength in the insurrection itself. They are disturbers of the peace at home, and nothing more here. They are disturbers of the peace of Europe, and can be nothing more there. Slaveholders, seeking to subvert justice and establish slavery, they have not even strength enough to destroy the Union. How idle are all the European policies which assume that such architects can build and maintain states! When shall we see the governments of Great Britain and France apprehending this truth? What new and unnecessary complications are we to go through before they discover and act upon it?

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 771.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 30, 1863.

SIR: * * * * *

So in regard to our foreign relations, the conviction has universally obtained that the true national policy is one of self-reliance and self-conduct in our domestic affairs, with absolute non-interference in those of other countries. These two important ideas are accepted with practical universality in the loyal States, while in the region covered by the insurrection they are resisted only by those who have staked their all upon the fortunes of a desperate strife.

Under these circumstances, Europe, with her attention already diverted from America, will no longer find provocation or encouragement here for a policy hostile to the settlement of our controversy upon the basis of our constitutional union. I think, moreover, that she cannot be long in discovering that, in lieu of her present partial illicit trade, with its constant annoyances, she has only to revoke her recognition of the insurgents as a belligerent to secure a return of peace, with a restoration of the commerce which prevailed before the civil war began. True there will, for a season, be a difference in the materials of exchange. But one has only to consider the immense forces of population and industry existing in the United States to become satisfied that whenever peace returns every source of national wealth now closed will soon be made to flow even more freely under the application of labor universally free than it did before, while slavery was maintained as a part of the industrial economy of the country.

Apprehensions that the aggrandizement of the United States as a commercial power can bring any practical inconvenience or danger to European states can disturb none but visionary minds. We can never be dangerous unless we are armed. We were never so great, and yet never so completely unarmed, as we were when this civil war broke out. We were never before so shorn of national prestige as we are now, through

the operation of domestic faction; yet we have never before been so strongly armed as we are at this moment, upon land and water. If we have ever been aggressive, it was the interest of slavery that made us belligerent abroad, as it was the same interest that has now afflicted ourselves with civil war. We can be only a peaceful nation, if we are left to enjoy our independence in the way that our destiny leads us. We can only become a disturber of the world's peace by being called into the world to defend that independence.

I do not know in what way Great Britain and France may think it expedient to reverse the injurious policy they have hitherto pursued in regard to us, but I think that in order to direct their attention with more earnestness to European affairs, they must soon come to the conclusion that it is wise to remit American affairs exclusively to the government of the United States.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No 802.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, January 6, 1864.

SIR: Your dispatch of the 11th of December (No. 554) has been received, and your proceedings therein related concerning the pirate Rappahannock are approved.

I acknowledge also the receipt of your dispatch of the 11th of December, No. 555, which is accompanied by a copy of the correspondence which has taken place between yourself and Earl Russell on the subject of the enlistment of pirates and equipment of ships of war by British subjects, and their naval operations on the high seas, against the unarmed merchantmen of the United States. The papers you have thus submitted to his lordship prove beyond a possible doubt that a systematic naval war has been carried on for more than a year by subjects of her Majesty from the British island as a base, and there is every reason for believing that unremitted efforts are made to give that warfare increased vigor and extension. It now appears from these papers that the belligerents have a regularly constituted treasury and counting-houses, with agents in London, for paying the wages of the British subjects who are enlisted there in this nefarious service. Hitherto remonstrances made by the United States to her Majesty's government have been held inconclusive and unsatisfactory, because it was said that they were not attended with such clear, direct, and conclusive proofs of the offenses complained of, as would enable the government to arrest the offenders, and apply judicial correction to the practices indicated. It seems to the President that this difficulty has now been fully and completely removed. Having recently brought to the knowledge of her Majesty's government flagrant violations of our national rights of a similar kind attempted in her Majesty's North American provinces, and having still more recently given to Earl Russell, through your hands, the avowal of all these transactions by domestic conspirators against the United States, it only remains for me to inform you that the President awaits, with deep concern, a determination by her Majesty's government of the grave question which you have been instructed to submit to them, namely, whether that government will

adopt any new measures to put an end to practices which are not less intolerable to the United States than they are inconsistent with the neutrality which her Majesty has proclaimed and enjoined upon all of her subjects. In writing so earnestly upon this subject, I do not by any means forget that recently her Majesty's government have taken measures to detain certain vessels which were being built for the purpose of carrying on war with the United States, nor do I overlook the fact that her Majesty's government have promised due attention to a special complaint which is referred to in this communication. The President does not, in the least, doubt that her Majesty's government are earnestly and seriously engaged in considering several of such complaints, distinctly and separately. Nevertheless, I trust that I shall not be thought unreasonably importunate in asking you again to press the general subject upon the attention of her Majesty's government, in the light of the facts now first brought to the knowledge of this department. Alarming events are occurring on our borders, prosecutions are pending in Great Britain. We have been obliged to institute a special naval and military police in the port of New York, which must soon prove as annoying to lawful traders from friendly states as to our own citizens, and thus new irritations are arising, and new controversies are gathering up between the two countries.

On our part we trace all the evils to an unnecessary, and, as we think, an anomalous recognition by her Majesty's government of insurgents as a naval power who have no pretensions to that title. We desire to know whether, after all its gross abuses and injurious consequences, that concession must remain unrevoked and unmodified. If it must remain, then we desire to know whether her Majesty's government can apply a cure to these abuses and consequences, or whether we are expected to devise and provide the proper remedies. If the British government is to do nothing, and the United States everything, I know not what security commerce can ever have hereafter against universal practices of privateering and piracy, except that even the lawful trade between friendly countries must be carried on under the protection of ever-present and adequate armed force.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 580.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, January 21, 1864.

SIR: The eccentricities of the rebels are among the most marked peculiarities of this war. It seems that they undertake to issue naturalization papers to aliens on board of vessels which have never yet themselves been able to get within their jurisdiction. I transmit a copy of my note to Lord Russell relating to this subject, and covering copies of two such papers, the originals of which are now in the hands of Mr. Dudley, the consul at Liverpool.

How long the British government will continue to put up with such things it is difficult to tell. Made daily more sensible of the difficulties into which their early measures have plunged them, they are still reluc-

tant to take any step which indicates the slightest admission that they were wrong.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, January 20, 1864.

MY LORD: I have the honor to submit to your consideration copies of two papers, the originals of which are in the possession of the consul of the United States at Liverpool.

It would seem by these papers as if the so-called naval officers of the insurgents in the United States assume to themselves the power on the ocean, not only as in former cases to constitute a court of admiralty on the quarter-deck for the condemnation of prizes, but also to naturalize the subjects of foreign sovereigns at sea, without the necessity of prior emigration or settlement in any vicinage.

I pray your lordship to accept the assurances, &c.,
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

Certificates of citizenship in favor of Frank Glassbrook, a free white man, twenty-four years of age.

To all whom it may concern :

Know all men by these presents that I, William L. Maury, a first lieutenant in the navy of the Confederate States of America, and captain of the armed steamer Georgia, a vessel of war belonging to said States, do hereby, and by virtue of authority in me vested by an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform rule of naturalization for persons enlisted in the armies of the Confederate States of America," do issue this my certificate in favor of Frank Glassbrook, a free white native of England, and now a seaman on board this vessel, and in the naval service of the Confederate States of America aforesaid, whereby the said Frank Glassbrook, having of his own free will, at the age of twenty-four years, enlisted in the naval service aforesaid, and taken the oath of allegiance to the said States, is made a *natural* citizen thereof, and invested with all the responsibilities, duties, obligations, and *privileges* that are by law attached to every naturalized citizen of the Confederate States of America.

Done at sea, on board the confederate States steamer Georgia, this 27th day of April, in the year of our Lord 1863.

In testimony whereof I hereunto affix my hand and seal.

WILLIAM L. MAURY, [L. S.]

First Lieut., Com'dg Confederate States Steamer Georgia.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 838.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 8, 1864.

SIR: Your dispatch of January 21 (No. 580) has been received, together with a copy of your note to Earl Russell on the subject of pretended rebel naturalization at sea. I have the pleasure of informing you that the spirit of that paper, as well as the terms in which it is expressed, are fully approved. The President thinks that the vigilance you have manifested in so promptly bringing the matter to the notice of her Majesty's government is worthy of especial commendation.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 596.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, February 12, 1864.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit a copy of a note addressed to me by Lord Russell in reply to mine of the 19th of last month, on the report of Mr. Mallory. * * * * *

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

FOREIGN OFFICE, *February 8, 1864.*

SIR: * * * * *

There is, however, one passage in your letter which it is impossible for her Majesty's government to pass over without especial notice; this passage is as follows: "I am further directed, respectfully, to represent that the toleration of these avowed enemies of the United States, whilst known to be carrying on these hostile practices, now fully revealed, within the British realm and its dependencies, without restraint of any kind, cannot be regarded as an exercise of the unquestioned right of sheltering political exiles, but rather as equivalent to permitting them to abuse that right for the purpose of more effectually availing themselves of British aid and co-operation now notoriously given them, in waging war with a country with which Great Britain is at peace."

In reply to this allegation, her Majesty's government think it right to state that her Majesty's dominions must necessarily continue to be open to the subjects of both belligerents, as long as her Majesty is at peace with both of them; but that her Majesty's government will, at the same time, continue to put in force, as they have hitherto done, to the full

extent of the means in their power, the laws of this country against those subjects of either of the belligerents who may be found, by transgressing those laws, to have abused the rights of hospitality, and to have offended against the authority of the Crown.

With regard to its being made a matter of complaint by the government of the United States, that her Majesty thought fit, upon the original commencement of hostilities, to recognize the status of belligerents in both the parties to this unhappy contest, her Majesty's government can only repeat the observation which they have had occasion to make on former occasions, in reply to similar representations received from you, that any other course would have justly exposed this country to a charge of violating the clearest principles and soundest precedents of international law.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 843.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, February 13, 1864.

SIR: * * * * *

I regret that the conversations with Earl Russell do not warrant an expectation that her Majesty's government is likely to take into early and serious consideration the complications of our international affairs. It would seem that interested and prejudiced sympathies with the insurgents are yet strong enough in England to persuade the government to be content to leave their relations towards this government upon their present basis. It is, nevertheless, a grave question whether, if so left, they must not inevitably fall into a worse and more perplexing condition. The state of our relations is this: Great Britain regards the insurgents as a lawful naval belligerent; we do not. Great Britain pursues a policy in regard to them based upon her view of their character; we pursue a different one. The dealings of British subjects with the insurgents in the insurrectionary region, in the loyal parts of the United States, in Great Britain, in her provinces, and on the high seas, are continually producing controversies and claims upon which the two governments cannot agree. Interested British subjects require her Majesty's government to ask of the United States explanations and concessions which they cannot make; and the interests of the United States and their citizens require this government to make claims which her Majesty's government think they cannot concede. These perplexities have continually increased with the progress of the war, until it already begins to be a cause of painful apprehension in both countries that, if peace should come to-day, it would be very difficult to adjust the controversies already ripened between the two nations. In Great Britain it is thought, or at least it seems desirable to think, that the result of this civil war is yet distant and uncertain; and this persuasion reconciles the government to a perseverance in the policy of which the United States complain. On the other hand, the war is believed here to be approaching its end, and that end is confidently expected to be a complete and

perfect re-establishment of the supremacy of the Union upon foundations broader than those upon which it has heretofore stood. The two national legislatures are in session, and each is likely to act more or less under the influence of national sentiments, prejudices, and passions. Under these circumstances, each government, more or less influenced by the same sentiments actively enforced by popular legislatures, must demand more and concede less. It is the earnest desire of the President that both governments may improve the present hour by a common preparation for a peaceful, friendly, and beneficent future.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM. H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 602.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, February 19, 1864.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit a copy of my note to Lord Russell of the 12th instant, in reply to his of the 8th, heretofore sent forward with my dispatch No. 596.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

[Extract.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, February 12, 1864.

MY LORD: *

I have never admitted the idea for a moment that, in acknowledging the belligerent character of the insurgents, it was the intention of her Majesty's government to yield to them extraordinary facilities for the abuse of the neutrality adopted by Great Britain. But it is impossible, in the face of the facts, to deny that such has been and is the case. The very position of a belligerent implies responsibility for its action; yet it is quite apparent that thus far no means have been arrived at by which effectively to impose any restraint upon its most lawless proceedings.

I pray your lordship to accept the assurances of the highest consideration, with which I have the honor to be, my lord, your most obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extracts.]

No. 861.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 3, 1864.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your dispatch of the 12th of February, (No. 596,) together with a copy of the note which, on the 8th of that month, Earl Russell addressed to you on the subject of naval preparations and movements in the interest of American insurgents in the ports of Great Britain.

* * * * *

I have considered, with profound regret, his lordship's remarks upon the necessity which, as he supposes, rests upon her Majesty's government to regard our insurgents as a belligerent; but I must be allowed to say, that had a different course been pursued many inconveniences now felt would have been prevented, and that only the persistence of her Majesty's government in that course hinders and delays the restoration of our relations to a state of mutual friendship, which would be honorable and useful to both countries, and would gratify the friends of peace and humanity throughout the world.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCOIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 869.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 11, 1864.

SIR: * * * * *

France, as well as Great Britain, seems unprepared to fully admit the decline of the insurrection. But I think we cannot be mistaken in the opinion that either of the nations would now propose to recede rather than to go further in the line of favor to that unprincipled and calamitous attempt at revolution.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM. H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCOIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 950.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 18, 1864.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your dispatch of the 27th of April, together with the reports of debates which have occurred in the House of Lords and in the House of Commons, concerning the case of the Tuscaloosa. I observe with much pleasure that the ministry have successfully vindicated the proceedings which they adopted in that case, for the purpose of maintaining the neutrality which her Maj-

esty so unequivocally, though prematurely, proclaimed at the beginning of our civil war.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 1068.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, August 15, 1864.

SIR:

If the emigration has been increased during our present civil war to the inconvenience of Europe, the maritime states of that continent are responsible for the increase. They unnecessarily adopted a policy of recognition of the insurgents as a belligerent, which was expected to produce a dissolution of the Union, whereby they have caused the insurrection to be continued with more vigor and effect than under other circumstances would have been witnessed.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 1, 1865, pp. 27, 28.]

No. 7.

Earl Russell to Lord Lyons.

FOREIGN OFFICE, November 26, 1864.

MY LORD:

3. The next proposition of the Secretary of State declares the neutrality proclaimed by her Majesty to have failed as well in the British home ports as in the colonies; that it must continue to fail so long as asylum is allowed there to active agents of the enemies of the United States, and so long as those persons are in any way able, by evasion or otherwise, to use the British ports and British borders as a base for felonious depredations; and the Secretary of State adds that the only remedy which the government of the United States is able to conceive is the "recognition by her Majesty's government of the first and exclusive sovereignty of the United States in all the waters and territories legally subject to the jurisdiction of this government."

It appears to her Majesty's government that this proposal amounts to nothing less than a demand that Great Britain should cease to acknowledge the belligerent character of the southern States, and treat the southern citizens as felons and pirates. In order to consider this matter fully, I find it necessary to recur to the events of the last three years.

President Lincoln, immediately after his accession to power, in 1861,

found himself face to face with a most formidable insurrection. In the month of April, 1861, he ordered a levy of 75,000 men to meet the danger. Finding this number insufficient, armies of 300,000, 400,000, and even 700,000 men have been raised, embodied, marched, exposed to battles and sieges, worn by fight and fever, exhausted, consumed, and replenished in this mighty contest. With similar purposes the President, in the same month of April, 1861, proclaimed the blockade of the coasts of seven States, and the blockade of two other States was added immediately afterward. A navy was suddenly created, supposed to be adequate to the task of blockading 3,000 miles of coast.

Her Majesty's government could not, any more than the other powers of Europe, fail to recognize in the vast extent of the territories involved in hostilities and in the fierce nature of the contest, a civil war of the most extraordinary character. In proclaiming that both parties in this vast war were to be treated as belligerents, and in admitting the validity of a blockade of 3,000 miles of coast, her Majesty's government acknowledged an existing fact, and recognized the international law applicable to that fact.

But her Majesty's government could not disguise from themselves the difficulties which would beset, under any state of law, the task of preventing undue aid being given by individuals among the Queen's subjects to one or the other of the belligerents. The identity of language, the increasing intercourse of trade, the immense extent of ship-building carried on in this country, and the ingenuity of speculators in defeating laws and proclamations, made it impossible that there should not be many escapes from the vigilance of the government, and many successful stratagems to disguise hostile proceedings.

Still her Majesty's government counted on the fair consideration by the government of the United States of what was possible, on their estimate of the honest intention of the British executive, and their knowledge of the latitude, both of opinion and of action, prevailing among a people nurtured, like that of the United States, in free institutions.

Her Majesty's government also thought that the United States must be aware that the law of nations and the circumstances of the war gave an immense advantage to the federals against the confederates in obtaining warlike supplies. In confirmation of this remark, it may be reckoned that, besides very many batteries of artillery, 500,000 rifles have been manufactured in this country, and conveyed to the shores of the northern States, to be used by the federal troops in the war. It may safely be said, also, that many thousands of the Queen's subjects have held those rifles against the breasts of men whom her Majesty does not regard as her enemies.

The supplies sent to the confederates are, on the other hand, very commonly intercepted and captured on the sea by federal ships of war.

Her Majesty's government, however, have put in force impartially the provisions of the law, and have prosecuted those persons who, in apparent violation of that law, have fitted out vessels in our ports with the purpose, as it was believed, of aiding in hostilities against the United States, or who have been engaged in enlisting seamen or recruits in the service of either belligerent; and her Majesty's government have succeeded in preventing the departure from the Clyde and the Mersey of several ships intended for the service of the confederates.

Such being the state of affairs, her Majesty's government are not prepared either to deny to the southern States belligerent rights, or to propose to Parliament to make the laws of the United Kingdom generally more stringent.

To allow to the United States the belligerent rights of blockade and of search and detention to the widest extent, and to refuse them altogether to the other party in the civil war, who have possession of an extensive territory, who have all the forms of a regular government framed on the model of the United States, and who are wielding large regular armies, would, her Majesty's government presume to think, be as contrary to the practice of civilized nations as it would be to the rules of justice and of international law. Neither can her Majesty's government refuse an asylum to persons landing on our shores and conforming to our laws, merely because such persons may be or may have been in hostility with a government or nation with whom her Majesty is at peace.

The Congress and President of the United States have thought themselves compelled, by the necessity of internal war, to restrict and curtail the liberties of the people of those States. Her Majesty's government do not presume to judge of that necessity; but they cannot find in the hostilities which prevail on the continent of North America any justification for so altering the laws of the United Kingdom as to deprive the citizens of the southern States of America of that asylum which Great Britain has always afforded to men of all nations and of all political opinions.

But while the government of the United States complain that her Majesty's policy of neutrality has failed, her Majesty's government have had frequent occasions to complain that the United States have carried beyond all acknowledged limits the rights of belligerents. The crews of vessels seized as blockade-runners, who by the law of nations are only subject to detention till the case of the vessel in which they were found has been heard in a prize court, have been subjected to confinement for an indefinite period of time as prisoners of war, and her Majesty's government have more than once felt it to be their duty to express their opinion that such proceedings are a plain violation of neutral rights.

The United States government have also compelled British merchants, trading between New York and a neutral port, to give bonds for the conduct to be observed by them in that port, and for the direction of their future voyages, and this is against the plain tenor of the treaties subsisting between Great Britain and the United States.

The government of the United States have likewise permitted their subordinates and recruiting agents to enlist British subjects who had been drugged, and had not when so enlisted recovered from the effects of the treatment to which they had been subjected.

If her Majesty's government have not resisted more strenuously than they have hitherto done these illegal and unfriendly proceedings, the cause is to be found in their belief that the passion and excitement of the contest have for a time obscured the sense of justice and respect for law which usually distinguish the United States, and that with the close of the contest calm consideration will return, and a just view of these transactions will be taken.

The welfare and prosperity of the United States are earnestly desired by the government of her Majesty, and the necessity of securing peace and harmony on the border between the British and the United States territory is fully acknowledged. With this disposition on both sides, her Majesty's government cannot doubt that adequate means of repression will be found, and that signal failure will attend any wicked attempts which may be made to involve the two nations in the calamities of war.

It is a pleasure to me to conclude this dispatch by noticing the handsome terms in which the Secretary of State declares himself not only able,

but obliged, to acknowledge that the Canadian authority has, in the last instance mentioned, "thus far co-operated with this government in faithful and diligent efforts to bring the disturbers of public peace to justice." Her Majesty's government trust such faithful co-operation in the performance of friendly offices may long continue on both sides.

I have to instruct you to give a copy of this dispatch to the Secretary of State.

I am, &c.,

RUSSELL.

[The first part of this dispatch is printed under the head of "Enforcement of Neutrality."]

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 823.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, December 1, 1864.

SIR: I transmit herewith a copy of the London Times of this morning, containing a letter addressed by Lord Russell to the three rebel emissaries who were directed to present to him the manifesto which has been issued from Richmond.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Earl Russell to Messrs. Slidell, Mason and Mann.

[From the London Times, of December 1, 1864.]

THE MANIFESTO OF THE CONFEDERATE STATES.

The foreign secretary has made the following reply to the manifesto of the Confederate States, which we published on Saturday last:

"FOREIGN OFFICE, *November 25, 1864.*

"GENTLEMEN: I have had the honor to receive the copy which you have sent me of the manifesto issued by the congress of the so-called Confederate States of America.

"Her Majesty's government deeply lament the protracted nature of the struggle between the northern and southern States of the formerly united republic of North America.

"Great Britain has since 1783 remained, with the exception of a short period, connected by friendly relations with both the northern and the southern States. Since the commencement of the civil war, which broke out in 1861, her Majesty's government have continued to entertain sentiments of friendship equally for the North and for the South. Of the causes of the rupture her Majesty's government have never presumed to judge; they deplore the commencement of this sanguinary struggle, and anxiously look forward to the period of its termination. In the mean time they are convinced that they best consult the interests of peace, and respect the rights of all parties, by observing a strict and impartial neu-

trality. Such a neutrality her Majesty has faithfully maintained, and will continue to maintain.

"I request you, gentlemen, to accept, &c.

"RUSSELL.

"J. SLIDELL, Esq., J. MASON, Esq., and A. DUDLEY MANN, Esq."

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 1201.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 26, 1864.

SIR: Your dispatch of December 1 (No. 823) has been received, together with a copy of a note which Earl Russell has written to James M. Mason, John Slidell, and Dudley Mann. If the present government of her Majesty were less just or generous towards the United States than they are, I might think it wise to raise a question upon that extraordinary communication.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 886.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, March 2, 1865.

SIR: I have to acknowledge the reception of dispatches from the department, numbered from 1262 to 1269, inclusive; also three printed copies of the new regulations respecting passports.

On Saturday last the cabinet, finding that the health of Lord Lyons was not likely to be soon restored, decided upon making a new appointment without further delay. On Monday I received a private and confidential note from Lord Russell apprising me that Sir Frederick Bruce had been selected to fill his place. The reason assigned is, the probability that the questions of the Lake convention and of the reciprocity treaty may give rise to negotiations.

The appointment seems to me a good one. The strong testimony borne by Mr. Burlingame to the friendly disposition of this gentleman in China has been sustained, so far as I have had an opportunity to judge by what I have seen of him since his return home. He paid me a friendly visit on his arrival, since which he has been constantly in Scotland.

It is undoubtedly intended in an amicable sense by the government, and is so regarded here. I had the other evening a few minutes' conversation with Baron Brunnow, the Russian ambassador, in which I found him very earnest in pressing this view of the subject. He dwelt on the adverse influences brought to bear here, both from without and within, to bring about a misunderstanding. He seemed to speak from personal knowledge, and with great confidence on this point; and he appeared to fear that we were not sufficiently impressed with the importance of counteracting it. I told him how strongly I had myself written in this sense for some time past. He intimated that he should himself write to M. de Stoeckl, at Washington, about it.

It is very certain that the alarmist policy continues to be actively pushed. The Times has fallen into it by perverting, as it too often does,

that passage of your dispatch No. 1258 which alludes to a proposal made in the conference at Fortress Mouroe, by the rebel agents, to raise some extrinsic issue, as if you had favorably entertained it. Much use is made of the notice to rescind the treaties, to prove our intentions to pick a quarrel. The commercial classes affect to be deeply apprehensive of our movements; I learn that some of them decline to enter into engagements of a prospective character with Americans on this ground alone. Thus far the political effect of these operations has been trifling. The government gives no countenance to them. At the same time it is undeniable that a little uneasiness is felt by it about the exposed situation of Canada, and the possibility that the popular passions may precipitate us into hostilities on their weak side. I have sedulously endeavored to soothe this feeling by treating the matter as lightly as possible. If the Canadians would but secure the peace of their border, I have said that peace on that side would be perfectly secure, and further precautions become unnecessary.

One curious effect of all these movements is to render the prospect of a reconciliation in America more and more unwelcome. It is regarded as likely to prompt the adoption of a peremptory tone on our part in regard to the unsettled controversies engendered by the war, which will force Great Britain either to make mortifying concessions, or else to bring on a rupture. These apprehensions are, doubtless, aggravated by a consciousness of the false position in which the governing classes placed the country so precipitately at the outset, and their unequivocal later manifestations of ill will. They do not now find so many avenues of public expression as they might, on account of the near approach of a general election. Yet I feel it my duty to dwell upon them a little in order that the government may be the more fully possessed of the facts, and, therefore, better enabled to adapt its policy to the emergency.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 1296.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, March 10, 1865.

SIR: Your two dispatches of February 23 (Nos. 883 and 884) have been received. Both relate to one general subject, and I shall therefore consider them together. That subject is an apprehension which prevails in British political circles that the close of our civil strife will be improved by this government to inaugurate a war with Great Britain, in which war Canada will be the objective point. The restrictive policy in regard to Canada, which we were compelled to adopt, to counteract aggressions from British provinces and ports, seems to be regarded as a fresh proof of the inimical purpose referred to, while a supposed general unfriendliness on my own part is assumed in justification of the suspicion.

The conciliatory manner in which this government has met the explanations which were recently made to you by Earl Russell appears in my recent dispatches. I think it completely removes the ground upon which the suspicion complained of was erected. It can be of little import to the two countries what my personal sentiments or feelings towards Great Britain are, yet, with a view to disembarass you entirely of the

objections raised on that account, I am permitted to say that in no instance has any proceeding which could affect our relations with Great Britain been adopted by this government, during the administration of the present Executive, which has not either originated with or, at least, been cordially supported by myself; to which may be added that the proceedings of the government set forth in my aforementioned dispatch were adopted upon my own motion. Whether the policy which has governed our course of proceedings during this painful civil war has been just and friendly towards Great Britain, and towards all other nations, is a question which is freely left to the decision of mankind.

In an interview with Mr. Burnley yesterday, invited by myself, I authorized him to inform Earl Russell that in my judgment, even had there been no disturbance of our friendly relations with Canada or Great Britain, the late reciprocity treaty could not have been continued beyond its appointed time, without being modified so essentially as to require a thorough revision of the compact, and that such a revision would necessarily involve a submission of the whole subject to not only the Senate but to the Congress of the United States. I observed further to Mr. Burnley that, in my opinion, it would be utterly unavailing to attempt to negotiate with Great Britain a treaty of reciprocal trade between the United States and Canada, while this civil war continues, with Great Britain in her present attitude, recognizing the insurgents as a belligerent, and thus derogating the United States from their accustomed sovereignty over all the territory and all the citizens of the republic. I gave my reasons for this, namely, that the present condition of things has proved destructive of our national commerce, and subversive of friendship between our people and those of Great Britain. I further stated to Mr. Burnley that there seems good reason to believe that this civil war has already come, or is about coming, to such a crisis that we may look for an early recognition of our full national authority by Great Britain, and that when that change shall take place this government will cheerfully enter into negotiations, with a view to ascertain whether a just, fair, and equal reciprocity in trade can be established between the United States and Canada. Of course, in this matter I am not to be understood as assuming to speak for the Senate or for Congress.

You will see that in this proceeding I anticipated an important suggestion of Earl Russell, communicated in your dispatch now before me, which suggestion is accepted as having been made in the interest of peace and friendship. Perhaps it is not improper to add, that in no case does this government contemplate war against Great Britain, whether for Canada, or any other object. So far are we from seeking either an occasion, or a cause, or a theater of war with Great Britain, we are earnestly desiring peace, friendship, and communion with that great nation. But, on the other hand, I repeat, and must continue to insist, that the United States cannot consent to endure indefinitely the injuries resulting, directly and indirectly, from the present policy of Great Britain in regard to the existing insurrection. They cannot consent to remain derogated as a naval power to a level with a local slavery-upholding rebellion, destitute of ports, courts, and ships of war. Nevertheless, our policy is directed to the redress of this wrong by lawful and peaceful means; and it will be persisted in, in the same manner, until other powers shall concede to the United States the position they held, with the free consent of all nations, before the insurrection began.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 1302.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 13, 1865.

SIR: I have before me several dispatches from Mr. Bigelow, our minister at Paris, relating to the affair of the pirate Stonewall, *alias* Olinde, *alias* Stoerkodder * * also dispatches, concerning the same subject, from Horatio Perry, esq., our chargé d'affaires at Madrid.

I am directed by the President on this occasion not to pursue further the question of ultimate accountability on the part of any foreign state for what has been done or has happened, or whatever may yet happen in connection with the Stonewall, *alias* the Olinde, *alias* the Stoerkodder. But I beg leave earnestly to appeal to the several governments to avail themselves of the present incident to reflect that the trouble now experienced has grown out of their attribution of belligerent naval rights to the rebels of the United States, in departure from all safe precedents. I appeal to them also to consider whether it is right, just, or expedient to pursue any further their past policy in regard to the insurgents, in disregard of the protest of the United States, now once more firmly and earnestly renewed.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, &co., &co., &co.

[Same, *mutatis mutandis*, to Messrs. Bigelow, Perry, and Wood.]

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extracts.]

No. 910.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, March 30, 1865.

SIR: I have to acknowledge the reception of dispatches numbered from 1280 to 1302, both inclusive, with the exception of No. 1282, already received and acknowledged on the 17th instant.

The most important of these relate to the condition of the relations between the two countries, and to the duty of reiterating to the British government the suggestions heretofore urged as to withdrawing from the rebels the recognition as belligerents, so precipitately made by it in the first place. I shall, of course, seize an early opportunity to obtain an interview with Lord Russell, in order to communicate your views.

The events now passing with such rapidity in America have the effect to vary in equal proportion the state of opinion in this country. The alarmist policy, for a time resorted to as a means of upholding sympathy for the rebel cause, of the course of which I have kept you so fully apprised in former dispatches, received its first shock in the earlier debate in the Commons on the Canada estimates, and has now pretty thoroughly died away. The final blow was given to it by Mr. Cardwell, the colonial secretary, when he announced the decision made to abide by the arrangement of 1817 about armament on the Canadian boundary lines. There is now not a word said about the danger of war from the United

States. I am told the impression is almost universal that that now waged will soon terminate in our complete success.

Such being the case, there appears to be less necessity for anxiety as to the possible effect of measures adopted on our side upon movements here. The only question left for consideration is one of expediency in regard to the mode of pressing them upon this government. Inasmuch as there is such strong reason to expect before long the question of belligerency to expire by its natural limitation, I cannot but think that this government would be more likely to anticipate a decision if it were left to the appearance of doing so as a voluntary act, than if placed in the light of yielding to dictation. It is not impossible that the fate of the application to Richmond might furnish the opportunity desired. The one great dread of the prime minister, as it regards American affairs, is that of appearing to be bullied. It inspired his whole course of action, as I well recollect, in the Trent case. It has had great influence in producing the sluggishness with which our remonstrances have been generally met. It is this feeling, shared in some degree by both branches of the English race, that interposes most of the obstructions in the way of their harmony. I shall endeavor to bear this in mind while I labor to execute your instructions.

I cannot but view it as quite fortunate for myself that the British government, in sending out Sir Frederick Bruce, has determined to transfer the discussion of the reciprocity treaty to Washington. I confess I should regard a proceeding very ominous of failure with this government which was directed to begin by imposing as an absolute condition upon it the performance of an act having no immediate connection with the subject-matter of the negotiation.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 1336.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 4, 1865.

SIR: Your dispatch of the 16th of March (No. 893) has been received. I approve entirely of all that you have written therein concerning the expediency of a conciliatory tone on our part towards Great Britain. That tone has been preserved by us to the highest degree which is compatible with the spirit of a nation that not only is deeply injured in its rights by a prostitution by British subjects of the Queen's proclamation of neutrality, but is also deeply wounded in its generous national spirit. I reaffirm what you have said to Earl Russell, that the United States are not grasping for Canada, nor are they cherishing any purpose of retaliation or revenge. But I must at the same time ask you to urge upon Earl Russell that every day's persistence by Great Britain in an attitude of proclaimed neutrality by the government which is violated with impunity, by British subjects, on the ocean and upon our borders, increases the alienation which both governments justly deplore. The time has come when the United States may not only rightly but with serious earnestness ask relief.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 1337.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 4, 1865.

SIR: I give you herewith a copy of a note from Mr. Burnley, which announces the discharge of the St. Albans felons from arrest upon our treaty requisition, and of orders for their re-arrest for violations of the Queen's neutrality.

I append also a copy of my latest instructions upon the subject to the United States consul at Montreal.

And further, a copy of a notice which has this day issued from the Department of State.

You will please bring these proceedings to the notice of Earl Russell, and inform him of my apprehensions that the new judicial prosecution which has been instituted will fail like so many others.

Such an event would be very untoward, and produce much exasperation. It is not easily seen why her Majesty's government should continue to recognize as a belligerent a class of men despicable in numbers. Although they recklessly trample the laws of Great Britain under their feet, while committing atrocious crimes against a friendly power, yet they can neither be surrendered to us for punishment, nor subjected to punishment by British tribunals.

It certainly would not be an easy task to satisfy the people of the United States that, in enduring such proceedings, this government exercises a just protection over the lives and property of our citizens, and a right sense of national honor.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Burnley to Mr. Seward.

WASHINGTON, April 3, 1865.

MY DEAR SIR: Viscount Monk informs me by telegraph that the Canadian courts had decided that the St. Albans raiders could not be surrendered, and they were consequently discharged.

It appears, however, that the governor general directed their immediate re-arrest on a charge of violating the Queen's neutrality.

Believe me to remain, my dear sir, yours very faithfully,

J. HUME BURNLEY.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Potter.

[Extract.]

No. 115.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 21, 1865.

SIR: Your dispatch of March 15 (No. 170) has been received and carefully considered. The disposition and proceedings of the United States towards Canada have been friendly and liberal. The wrongs we have

suffered from her have been unprovoked. Of all the felons harbored there, who have assailed our cities and citizens, only one has yet been delivered up to us upon our demand, and not one has yet been punished.

We can go no further in the way of conciliation until we have some greater show of reciprocity.

It may seem to the Canadians that they are relieved from responsibility to us by their political connection with other portions of the British empire, distinguished for illiberality to our country, but that circumstance so far increasing, diminishes our security.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

JOHN F. POTTER, Esq.,
U. S. Consul General, Montreal.

NOTICE.

To all whom these presents may concern :

Whereas, for some time past, evil-disposed persons have crossed the borders of the United States, or entered their ports by sea from countries where they are tolerated, and have committed capital felonies against the property and life of American citizens, as well in the cities as in the rural districts of the country :

Now, therefore, in the name and by the authority of the President of the United States, I do hereby make known that a reward of one thousand dollars will be paid, at this department, for the capture of each of such offenders, upon his conviction by a civil or military tribunal, to whomsoever shall arrest and deliver such offenders into the custody of the civil or military authorities of the United States. And the like reward will be paid upon the same terms for the capture of any such persons so entering the United States, whose offenses shall be committed subsequently to the publication of this notice.

A reward of five hundred dollars will be paid, upon conviction, for the arrest of any person who shall have aided and abetted offenders of the class before named within the territory of the United States.

[L. S.] Given under my hand, and the seal of the Department of State,
at Washington, this fourth day of April, A. D. 1865.

WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extracts.]

No. 917.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, April 7, 1865.

SIR: I have made a careful examination of the instructions that have been given to me in your several dispatches, numbered 1250, 1256, 1274, 1278, 1293, 1296, 1297, 1304, 1310, and 1313, all of them more or less enjoining it upon me to renew remonstrances against the course of the British government in continuing to recognize the rebels as a belligerent on the ocean, and claiming indemnity for the depredations of the vessels that have been fitted out from this kingdom under the shelter

thus given. They likewise direct me to demand an early revocation of that measure.

On mature reflection I have concluded the best policy to be to compress the execution of the whole of the instructions which I have received in the contents of a single note. This has been carefully prepared, and will probably be ready to be sent in to-day. As it is rather long, I am afraid that there will not be time enough to transmit to you a copy by this steamer.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 927.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, April 13, 1865.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit a copy of the note addressed by me to Lord Russell on the 7th instant, reference to which was made by me in my dispatch No. 917, of last week, as not then ready to be sent.

Lord Russell has acknowledged the reception of this note, but has delayed a reply, for the reason assigned in my No. 922, which goes to you hereafter.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, April 7, 1865.

MY LORD: I have the honor to transmit to you a copy of a letter addressed to the Secretary of State at Washington, by the consul of the United States at Rio Janeiro, Mr. Monroe, making a report of the depredations committed upon the commerce of the United States by the vessel known in the port of London as the *Sea King*, but since transformed into the *Shenandoah* by a process already fully explained in a note which I had the honor to address to your lordship on the 18th of November last.

I regret to be obliged to add, that this same vessel has been, since the date of Mr. Monroe's letter, heard of at Melbourne, from which place further details of similar outrages have been received. The particulars have been communicated to my government, but there has not yet been sufficient time for me to obtain its instructions in regard to them. I cannot doubt, however, that they will be the same in substance as those embraced in the last dispatch.

Were there any reason to believe that the operations carried on in the ports of her Majesty's kingdom and its dependencies to maintain and

extend this systematic depredation upon the commerce of a friendly people had been materially relaxed or prevented, I should not be under the painful necessity of announcing to your lordship the fact that my government cannot avoid entailing upon the government of Great Britain the responsibility for this damage.

It is impossible to be insensible to the injury that may yet be impending from the part which the British steamer *City of Richmond* has had, in being suffered to transport with impunity, from the port of London, men and supplies, to place them on board the French-built steam ram *Olinde*, alias *Stoerkodder*, alias *Stonewall*, which has, through a continuously fraudulent process, succeeded in deluding several governments of Europe, and in escaping from this hemisphere on its errand of mischief in the other.

I am by no means insensible to the efforts which have already been made and are yet making by her Majesty's government to put a stop to such outrages in this kingdom and its dependencies. Neither can I permit myself to doubt the favorable disposition of her ministers to maintain amicable relations with the government which I represent. While perfectly ready to bear testimony to the promptness with which all the numerous remonstrances and representations which it has been my painful duty heretofore to submit have been met and attended to by your lordship, it is at the same time impossible for me to dispute the fact that the hostile policy which it is the object of all this labor to prevent has not only not been checked, but is even now going into execution with more and more complete success. That policy, I trust I need not point out to your lordship, is substantially the destruction of the whole mercantile navigation belonging to the people of the United States. The nature of the process by which this is coming about may readily be appreciated by a brief examination of the returns of the registered tonnage of her Majesty's kingdom for the last six years. I have the honor to append to this note a tabular statement of the number of merchant ships built, and of the tonnage owned in the United States, which have been transferred to British owners in the successive years, beginning with 1858 and ending in 1864, so far as the materials at hand from the official reports of the two governments can supply the information.

I trust it will be needless for me to do more than to point out to your lordship the inference deducible from this statement, to wit, that the United States commerce is rapidly vanishing from the face of the ocean, and that that of Great Britain is multiplying in nearly the same ratio. Furthermore, it is my painful duty to suggest that this process is going on by reason of the action of British subjects in co-operation with emissaries of the insurgents, who have supplied from the ports of her Majesty's kingdom all the materials, such as vessels, armament, supplies, and men, indispensable to the effective prosecution of this result on the ocean.

So far as I am aware, not a single vessel has been engaged in these depredations excepting such as have been so furnished, unless, indeed, I might except one or two passenger steamers belonging to persons in New York, forcibly taken possession of whilst at Charleston in the beginning of the war, feebly armed and very quickly rendered useless for any aggressive purpose. It may, then, on the face of this evidence, be fairly assumed as true that Great Britain, as a national power, is, in point of fact, fast acquiring the entire maritime commerce of the United States by reason of the acts of a portion of her Majesty's subjects engaged in carrying on war against them on the ocean during a time of peace

between the two countries. I deeply regret to be constrained to add that every well-meant effort of her Majesty's government to put a stop to this extraordinary state of things, down to this time, has proved almost entirely fruitless.

I would most respectfully invite your lordship to produce in the history of the world a parallel case to this of endurance by one nation of injury done to it by another, without bringing on the gravest of complications. That in this case no such event has followed, has been owing, in the main, to a full conviction that her Majesty's government has never been animated by any aggressive disposition towards the United States, but, on the contrary, that it has steadily endeavored to discountenance, and in a measure to check, the injurious and malevolent operations of many of her subjects. But whilst anxious to do full justice to the amicable intentions of her Majesty's ministers, and on that account to forbear from recourse to any but the most friendly and earnest appeals to reason and to their sense of justice for a rectification of these wrongs, it is impossible to resist the conviction that heretofore their measures, however well intended, have never proved effective to remedy the evil complained of. Prompt to acquit them of any design, I am reluctantly compelled to acknowledge the belief that practically this evil had its origin in the first step taken, which can never be regarded by my government in any other light than as precipitate, of acknowledging persons as a belligerent power on the ocean before they had a single vessel of their own to show floating upon it. The result of that proceeding has been that the power in question, so far as it can be entitled to the name of a belligerent on the ocean at all, was actually created in consequence of the recognition, and not before; and all that it has subsequently attained of such a position has been through the labors of the subjects of the very country which gave it that title in advance. Neither is the whole case stated even now. The results equally show that the ability to continue these operations with success during the whole term of four years that the war has continued, has been exclusively owing to the opportunity to make use of this granted right of a belligerent in the courts, and the ports and harbors of the very power that furnished the elements of its existence in the outset. In other words, the kingdom of Great Britain cannot but be regarded by the government I have the honor to represent, as not only having given birth to this naval belligerent, but also as having nursed and maintained it to the present hour.

In view of all these circumstances, I am instructed, whilst insisting on the protest heretofore solemnly entered against that proceeding, further respectfully to represent to your lordship that, in the opinion of my government, the grounds on which her Majesty's government have rested their defense against the responsibility incurred in the manner heretostated, for the evils that have followed, however strong they might have heretofore been considered, have now failed by a practical reduction of all the ports heretofore temporarily held by the insurgents. Hence the President looks with confidence to her Majesty's government for an early and an effectual removal of all existing causes of complaint on this score, whereby the foreign commerce of the United States may be again placed in a situation to enjoy the rights to which it is entitled on the ocean, in peace and safety from annoyance from the injurious acts of any of her Majesty's subjects, perpetrated under the semblance of belligerent rights. I am further instructed to invite the attention of your lordship to another subject in this immediate connection.

From the beginning of this war the armed vessels of her Majesty have continued to enjoy full and free pratique in the waters of the United

States. They have been welcomed in just the same friendly manner as has been heretofore customary when there was no exclusion of the same class of ships of the United States from the waters of Great Britain. It is the opinion of the President that the time has come when it may be asked, not only with strict right but also with entire comity, when the reciprocity of these hospitalities is to be restored. It is the expectation that the naval force of the United States in European waters will be augmented on or about the beginning of next month, when this question may become one of some interest. I am, therefore, directed to solicit information from your lordship as to the reception which these vessels may expect in the ports of this kingdom.

I pray your lordship to accept the assurances of the highest consideration with which I have the honor to be, my lord, your lordships most obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Honorable EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

[Mr. Monroe to Mr. Seward, November 20, 1864, is printed under the head of "The Shenandoah," with extract from preceding dispatch No. 027.]

Statements in tabular form of American vessels sold to British subjects from 1858 to 1864, inclusive.

United States official report.

Before the war.			During the war.		
Year.	No. vessels.	Tonnage.	Year.	No. vessels.	Tonnage.
1858	33	12, 684	1861	126	71, 573
1859	49	21, 308	1862	135	64, 578
1860	41	13, 683	1863	348	252, 379
			1864	106	92, 052
Three years	123	47, 675	Four years	715	480, 682

British official report.

Before the war.			During the war.		
Year.	No. vessels.	Tonnage.	Year.	No. vessels.	Tonnage.
1860	Not given.	11, 716	1861	Not given	68, 757
			1862	Do.	50, 103
			1863	608	328, 665
One year		11, 716	Three years	608	454, 525

Mr. Hunter to Mr. Adams.

No. 1394.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 5, 1865.

SIR: Your dispatch of the 20th ultimo, No. 930, has been received.

It is believed that, however slight may have been the effect of the military news which had reached England at the date of your dispatch,

that which has subsequently gone forward will be more justly appreciated. But for the deplorable event which has shrouded the land in mourning, our rejoicing over the opening future would be unalloyed. Surely the maritime powers can need no further arguments to persuade them to withdraw the concession of belligerent rights to the insurgents on the ocean, since it seems that the insurrection is practically suppressed. Your observations upon the subject of our financial affairs have been submitted to the consideration of the Secretary of the Treasury.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

W. HUNTER,
Acting Secretary.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Hunter.

No. 952.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, May 11, 1865.

SIR: I have received from Lord Russell a note in reply to mine of the 7th of April last, a copy of which was transmitted to the department with my No. 927, of the 13th of April. Inasmuch as his lordship gives an official response to the two points of inquiry which I was instructed to propose, I send forward a copy of his note at once for the consideration of the President. Now that there seems to be very little left of the elements even of a *de facto* government in the insurgent States, the question raised is likely soon to expire by its own limitation. I perceive that in the House of Commons a question is about to be addressed to the government this evening relative to this subject. Should any reply of interest be elicited, I shall take care to furnish you a report of it.

In the note of Lord Russell he has thought it proper to expand the field of discussion by references to former events in a manner which appears to leave me no alternative to a reply. I am, therefore, now engaged in drawing up such a paper. This will leave entirely aside the two questions, the action upon which is of course reserved for the exclusive judgment of the government, and will relate only to the historical matter which has been brought into play. It will be impossible to get it prepared to send this week.

I am in hopes I shall be able to get a copy to you by the steamer of the next.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM HUNTER,
Acting Secretary of State.

Lord Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *May 4, 1865.*

SIR: I have had the honor to receive your note of the 7th of April, forwarding a copy of a letter addressed by the consul of the United States at Rio de Janeiro to his government upon the proceedings of a vessel called the *Sea King*, or *Shenandoah*, which vessel you state has since been heard of at Melbourne, whence details have been received of outrages com-

mitted by her on the commerce of the United States. You then proceed to say: "Were there any reasons to believe that the operations carried on in the ports of her Majesty's kingdom and its dependencies to maintain and extend this systematic depredation upon the commerce of a friendly people had been materially relaxed or prevented," you would not have had to announce to me "the fact that your government cannot avoid entailing upon the government of Great Britain the responsibility for this damage."

A British steamer, the *City of Richmond*, is next alluded to as having been allowed to take supplies from the port of London and to place them on board a French-built steam ram, known as the *Stonewall*, and you found upon the circumstances to which you have thus alluded a charge against Great Britain of not only not checking improper depredations on United States commerce, but of aiming at the destruction of the whole mercantile navigation belonging to the people of the United States; and while giving credit to her Majesty's government for endeavoring to check illicit proceedings of British subjects, you allege that the measures adopted in this respect by her Majesty's government have never proved effective, and that the evil of which you complain has its origin in the fact that her Majesty's government recognized the persons in arms against the United States as belligerents, and thereby improperly gave them a status which has led to a long continuance of hostilities; but as the ports held by them have fallen into the power of the United States, the President looked with confidence to a removal, by her Majesty's government, of this ground of complaint. You conclude by expressing a hope that the ships of war of the United States will be welcomed in British waters in the same friendly manner as has been heretofore customary.

Allow me to observe, in the first place, that I can never admit that the duties of Great Britain towards the United States are to be measured by the losses which the trade and commerce of the United States may have sustained. The question is not what losses the United States have sustained by the war, but whether in difficult and extraordinary circumstances the government of her Majesty have performed faithfully and honestly the duties which international law and their own municipal law imposed upon them.

Let me remind you that when the civil war in America broke out so suddenly, so violently, and so extensively, that event, in the preparation of which Great Britain had no share, caused nothing but detriment and injury to her Majesty's subjects, Great Britain had previously carried on a large commerce with the southern States of the Union, and had procured there the staple which furnished materials for the industry of millions of her people.

Had there been no war, the existing treaties with the United States would have secured the continuance of a commerce mutually advantageous and desirable. But what was the first act of the President of the United States? He proclaimed, on the 19th of April, 1861, the blockade of the ports of seven States of the Union. But he could lawfully interrupt the trade of neutrals to the southern States upon one ground only, namely, that the southern States were carrying on war against the government of the United States; in other words, that they were belligerents.

Her Majesty's government, on hearing of these events, had only two courses to pursue, namely, that of acknowledging the blockade and proclaiming the neutrality of her Majesty, or that of refusing to acknowledge the blockade and insisting upon the rights of her Majesty's subjects to trade with the ports of the South. Her Majesty's government pursued

the former course as at once the most just and the most friendly to the United States.

It is obvious, indeed, that the course of treating the vessels of the southern States as piratical vessels, and their crews as pirates, would have been to renounce the character of neutrals and to take part in the war; nay, it would have been doing more than the United States themselves, who have never treated the prisoners they have made either by land or sea as rebels and pirates, but as prisoners of war, to be detained until regularly exchanged.

So much as to the step which you say your government can never regard "as otherwise than precipitate," of acknowledging the southern States as belligerents. It was, on the contrary, your own government which, in assuming the belligerent right of blockade, recognized the southern States as belligerents. Had they not been belligerents the armed ships of the United States would have had no right to stop a single British ship upon the high seas.

The next complaint (often repeated I must admit) is, that vessels built in British ports, and afterwards equipped with an armament sent from the British coast, have injured, and, according to your account, almost destroyed the mercantile marine of the United States.

Now, the only question that can be put on that subject is, whether Great Britain has performed faithfully the duties incumbent upon her? I must here ask you to recollect that our foreign enlistment act, as well as your foreign enlistment act, requires proof that the vessel has been, or is about to be, equipped or armed within our dominions for the purpose of assisting a state or a body of men making war on a state in amity with her Majesty. In the case of the *Alabama*, which is always referred to as affording the strongest ground of complaint against her Majesty's government, the papers affording evidence of a design to equip the ship for the confederate service were furnished to me by you on the 22d, and more completely on the 24th of July, 1862. They were reported upon by the law officers on the 29th of that month. But on that very morning the *Alabama* was taken to sea on the false pretence of a trial trip.

I contend that in that case, as in all others, her Majesty's government faithfully performed their obligations as neutrals. It must be recollected that the foreign enlistment act, though passed in the year 1819, had never been actually put in force, and that it is still doubtful whether the evidence furnished by you on the 22d and 24th of July, though it was deemed a sufficient ground for detaining the *Alabama*, would have been found sufficient to procure a conviction from a jury, or even a charge in favor of condemnation of the vessel from a judge. Again, I repeat, the whole question resolves itself into this: whether the British government faithfully and conscientiously performed their duties as neutrals, or whether they, from any motives whatever, were guilty of a grave neglect of those duties?

Upon this point it might be sufficient for me to appeal to the unprejudiced judgment formed and expressed at the time by Mr. Seward, after every material fact had been communicated to him by your dispatches of the 25th and 31st of July and 1st of August, 1862. Writing to yourself on the 13th of August, 1863, he expressed the President's approval of the action which you had taken with respect to the *Orco* and the *Alabama*, (then called No. 290,) and added, "you will, on proper occasion, make known to Earl Russell the satisfaction which the President has derived from the just and friendly proceeding and language of the British government in regard to these subjects."

In maintaining this view of our duties, I have the satisfaction of

thinking that her Majesty's government were supported by some of the highest authorities of the United States. In 1815 a correspondence began between the ministers representing Spain and Portugal and the United States government, respecting the practice of fitting out privateers in the ports of the United States, putting them under a foreign flag and cruising against Spanish commerce. In January, 1817, Señor Onís, Spanish minister at Washington, says:

"It is notorious that although the speculative system of fitting out privateers and putting them under a foreign flag, one disavowed by all nations, for the purpose of destroying the Spanish commerce, has been more or less pursued in all the ports of the Union, it is more especially to those of New Orleans and Baltimore where the greatest violations of the respect due to a friendly nation, and, if I may say so, of that due to themselves, have been committed; whole squadrons of pirates having been sent out from thence in violation of the solemn treaty existing between the two nations, and bringing back to them the fruits of their piracies, without being yet checked in these courses either by the reclamations I have made, those of his Majesty's consuls, or the decisive and judicious orders issued by the President for that purpose."

It does not appear that any compensation was ever made for any of these seizures.

But the remonstrances of Portugal are still more applicable. On the 8th of March, 1818, Señor J. Correa de Serra brought to the knowledge of the United States government the case of three Portuguese ships which had been captured by privateers fitted out in the United States, manned by American crews and commanded by American captains, though under insurgent colors, and he demanded satisfaction and indemnification for the injury which had been done to Portuguese subjects, as well as to the insult which had been offered to the Portuguese flag. To this letter the American Secretary of State, after reciting the complaint of the Portuguese minister, replied as follows:

"The government of the United States having used all the means in its power to prevent the fitting out and arming of vessels in their ports to cruise against any nation with whom they are at peace, and having faithfully carried into execution the laws enacted to preserve inviolate the neutral and pacific obligations of this Union, cannot consider itself bound to indemnify individual foreigners for losses by capture over which the United States have neither control nor jurisdiction. For such events no nation can in principle, nor does in practice, hold itself responsible."

The Secretary of State, who signed this dispatch, bore a name most honorably known in the annals of the United States—the name of Adams.

The remaining events to be noticed in the history of the answers given by the United States to the complaints of Portugal during the wars of South America, and by Great Britain to the United States in the present war, may be recorded without any fear of comparison on the part of the government of her Majesty.

On the 20th of April, 1818, the amended act known as the American foreign enlistment act was passed.

On the 24th of November of that year, the Portuguese minister being asked by Mr. Adams to furnish a list of the names of the persons chargeable with a violation of the laws of the United States in fitting out and arming a vessel within the United States for the purpose of cruising against the subjects of his sovereign, and of the witnesses by whose testimony the charge could be substantiated, replied to the following effect:

"He had found with sorrow multiplied proofs that many of the armed

ships which had committed depredations on the property of Portuguese subjects were owned by citizens of the United States, had been fitted in ports of the Union, and had entered in several ports of the Union, captured ships and cargoes by unlawful means. Many of these citizens of the United States had the misfortune of believing that they did a meritorious action in supporting foreign insurrections, and offered great difficulties in the way of every prosecution instituted by a foreign minister. Prosecutions were ordered by the government of the United States, but did not appear to have had much effect in checking the depredations complained of."

In March, 1819, the Portuguese minister alleges that, in contrast to the Spanish insurgents who had ports and a long line of coast at their disposal, Urtegas, the chief whose flag was borne by United States privateers, was wandering with his followers in the inland mountains of Corrientes. "The Urtegan flag," he continues, "which has not a foot length of sea-shore in South America where it can show itself, is freely and frequently waving in the port of Baltimore. Urtegan cockades were frequently met with in that city in the hats of American citizens unworthy of that name."

In another note, dated the 23d of November, 1819, the Portuguese minister says: "I do justice to, and am grateful for, the proceedings of the Executive in order to put a stop to these depredations, but the evil is rather increasing. I can present to you, if required, a list of fifty Portuguese ships, almost all richly laden, some of them East Indiamen, which have been taken by these people during the period of full peace. This is not the whole loss we have sustained, this list comprehending only those captures of which I have received official complaints; the victims have been many more, besides violations of territory by landing and plundering ashore with shocking circumstances."

"One city alone on this coast," he says, "has armed twenty-six ships, which prey on our vitals, and a week ago three armed ships of this nature were in that port waiting for a favorable occasion of sailing for a cruise."

In July, 1820, the Portuguese minister proposed that the United States should appoint commissioners to confer and agree with commissioners of the Queen of Portugal, in what reason and justice might demand.

But Mr. Adams again says that for wrongs committed in United States territory, Portuguese subjects have a remedy in the courts of justice; "but for any acts of the citizens of the United States, committed out of their jurisdiction and beyond their control, the government of the United States is not responsible."

To this most just principle, which was again referred to Mr. Secretary Clayton, and maintained against the government of Portugal to this hour, the United States must be held still to adhere. No matter how many rich Portuguese ships were taken; no matter even what flag was borne by the vessels which took them; for these acts of the citizens of the United States, acting as the captains, officers, and crews of those cruisers, the United States government declared itself not responsible. Nor was that government induced to depart from that ground by the urgent representations of the Portuguese minister, in his letter to Mr. Webster, of the 7th of November, 1850, "that by due diligence on the part of the government and the officers of the United States, the evil might have been prevented;" and that "the fitting out of these vessels was not checked by all the means in the power of the government; but that there was a neglect of the necessary means of suppressing these expeditions." With regard to Spain the case was somewhat different,

as the United States had many outstanding claims against the government of Spain; and on the other hand, the claims of Spain were rested upon the interpretation placed by her on her treaty with the United States. The claims of the United States were used as a set-off against the claims of Spain on account of the depredations committed by the United States cruisers, commanded by United States captains, and in respect of other matters; and both orders of claims were renounced and abandoned by a treaty between Spain and the United States, concluded on the 22d of February, 1819.

Before I refer to the conduct of Great Britain during the present civil war, I must for a moment allude to an address of President Monroe, in regard to the South American insurrections.

"The revolutionary movement in the Spanish provinces in this hemisphere attracted the attention and excited the sympathy of our fellow-citizens from its commencement." Such is the statement of President Monroe in his special message of the 8th of March, 1822. It must be acknowledged that in this country the gallantry of the people of the southern States, in their endeavors to give to those States an independent position in the world, excited a large amount of sympathy. It must be acknowledged, also, that the desire of large profits from the sale of cargoes induced many of the Queen's subjects to engage in blockade running. But, on the other hand, it must be said that no British subject appears to have commanded a confederate cruiser, while United States citizens seem frequently to have acted as captains of the privateers which, under the flag of Buenos Ayres, or some other South American state, committed depredations on Spanish and Portuguese commerce. Nor was the vigilance of her Majesty's government at fault when, as in the case of the steam rams built at Birkenhead for a confederate agent, they were fully convinced that vessels of war were being constructed for purposes hostile to the United States. Indeed, so decided and so effective was the action of the government in detaining the vessels called the *El Tousson* and *El Monassia*, that it appears by the published parliamentary reports that a member of Parliament charged the government with having done, and with having done on their own confession, what was illegal and unconstitutional, without law, without justification, and without excuse. Unfounded as that charge was, yet, coming, as it appears, from high authority, it is obvious that nothing but the intimate conviction that those vessels were intended for confederate vessels of war, that unless detained they would attempt to break the blockade of the United States squadrons, and that such an act might have produced the gravest complications, could have sustained the government under the weight of charges thus urged.

Let us compare this case, in which her Majesty's government detained and seized the ships, with that of the *Shenandoah*, to which you refer, in which they did not interfere.

The *Shenandoah* was formerly the *Sea King*, a merchant or passage steamship, belonging to a mercantile company. She was sold to a merchant, and soon afterwards cleared for China as a merchant ship. Not a tittle of evidence was ever brought before her Majesty's government by you or any one else to show that she was intended for the service of the confederates. Had it been alleged even that her decks were stronger than usual, apparently for the purpose of carrying guns, it might have been plausibly answered that the China seas abounded with pirates, and that guns were necessary in order to drive them off.

But it is said that guns and men were sent to meet a confederate vessel at sea. So far as guns are concerned, this is not an offense against our

laws; nor am I aware of any authority in international law according to which the British government could be bound to prevent it. So far as men are concerned, they could not be interfered with without evidence of an intention or engagement to serve as confederate seamen, and no such evidence was ever offered to her Majesty's government. What if these guns and men were sent in a vessel which cleared for Bombay? Would it have been right for her Majesty's government, without evidence, to seize such a vessel? Would not proceedings thus unauthorized by law or by any legal grounds of suspicion have been loudly and universally condemned? It is true that arms were sent to the *Olinde*, a French vessel, and that the *Sea King*, having changed its character at sea, appeared afterwards as a confederate ship of war. But, in the words of Mr. Adams in 1818, "for such events no nation can in principle, nor does in practice, hold itself responsible."

With regard to the export of arms sent by individuals in this country to vessels on the high seas, it must not be forgotten that the government and courts of the United States have always upheld the legality of this traffic. On the subject of certain memorials of British subjects sent to the Secretary of State of the United States during the revolutionary war, Mr. Jefferson says, "We have answered that our citizens have always been free to make, send, or export arms; that it is the constant occupation and livelihood of some of them. To suppress their callings, the only means, perhaps, of their subsistence, because a war exists in foreign and distant countries, with which we have no concern, would hardly be expected. It would be hard in principle, and impossible in practice."

This, be it recollected, was not the opinion of Mr. Jefferson alone. He wrote by the direction of General (then President) Washington.

With respect to the alleged destruction of the mercantile navigation of the United States, it must be noted that it has been common to transfer American merchant ships, without change of cargo or of crew, nominally to British owners, in order to avoid the higher rates of insurance payable during war. With peace, the mercantile marine of the United States will, I have no doubt, be at least as numerous as before.

I am happy to see that you declare yourself by no means insensible to the efforts which her Majesty's government have made, and are still making, to put a stop to such outrages in this kingdom and its dependencies, and that you cannot permit yourself to doubt the favorable disposition of the Queen's ministers to maintain amicable relations with the government of the United States; nay, further, you state that the avoidance of the gravest of complications "has been owing, in the main, to a full conviction that her Majesty's government has never been animated by any aggressive disposition towards the United States, but, on the contrary, that it has steadily endeavored to discountenance, and, in a measure, to check the injurious and malevolent operations of many of her subjects." The question, then, really comes to this: Is her Majesty's government to assume or be liable to a responsibility for conduct which her Majesty's government did all in their power to prevent and punish?—a responsibility which Mr. Adams, on the part of the United States government in the case of Portugal, positively, formally, and justly declined.

Have you considered to what this responsibility would amount? Great Britain would become thereby answerable for every ship that may have left a British port and have been found afterwards used by the confederates as a ship of war; nay, more, for every cannon and every musket

used by the confederates on board any ship of war, if manufactured in a British workshop.

I now come to that part of your letter which relates to the future.

The late successes of the United States armies give us every reason to hope for a speedy termination of the war. In such case, the restrictions which have been imposed upon the vessels of the United States as belligerents will of course cease. In such case, also, it is to be presumed the cruisers and privateers of the confederates will be at once sold and converted into merchant vessels. But the present state of affairs does not allow me to speak with certainty upon this point.

The questions remain, however, first, whether the United States vessels of war will be now allowed to come into the harbors of her Majesty's dominions without other restrictions than those usual in times of peace; and another question closely connected with it, namely, whether the confederates are still to be treated as belligerents.

My answers are the following: In regard to the first question, her Majesty's government are quite willing that vessels of war of the United States shall be treated in the ports of her Majesty in the same manner as her Majesty's vessels of war are treated in the ports of the United States, with this single exception, that if an enemy's vessel of war should come into the same port, the vessel which shall first leave the port shall not be pursued by its enemy until twenty-four hours shall have elapsed.

Before answering the second question I wish to know whether the United States are prepared to put an end to the belligerent rights of search and capture of British vessels on the high seas? Upon the answer to this question depends the course which her Majesty's government will pursue.

All that I can do further is to assure you that her Majesty's government, who have lamented so sincerely the continuance of this painful and destructive contest, will hail with the utmost pleasure its termination, and will view with joy the restoration of peace and prosperity in a country whose well being and happiness must always be a source of satisfaction to the sovereign and people of these realms.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Hunter to Mr. Adams.

No. 1401.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 15, 1865.

SIR: The recent announcement of the arrival of the insurgent ram *Stonewall* at Nassau, where it is reported she had been allowed to coal, and the possibility that she might proceed thence to some point on our coast, has naturally excited some uneasiness here. Actuated, in part, at least, by this feeling, the President has directed me to address to Sir Frederick W. A. Bruce the note upon the subject, dated the 13th instant, a copy of which is inclosed. Earl Russell will undoubtedly receive a copy from him. The subject, however, is deemed important enough for you to seek an interview in regard to it with the secretary of state for foreign affairs, if, as is possible, belligerent rights should not have been withdrawn from the insurgents before this instruction shall reach you. If, contrary to all reasonable expectation, those rights shall still be con-

tinued to them, you will urgently and gravely remonstrate against this. You will add that this government, in view of the change of circumstances which has occurred, must be no longer expected to respect those rights on land or at sea; on the contrary, it must be expected henceforth to do whatever shall be necessary for the restoration of our national commerce, and its safe and competent protection. If collisions shall occur in doing this, we shall, in view of the changed condition of affairs in this country, to which I have already alluded, and of the ample and generous notice to the world in the proclamation* of the President, a copy of which is herewith inclosed, deem ourselves to be morally justified and to be absolved from any consequences which might ensue from such a step.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

W. HUNTER,
Acting Secretary.

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Hunter to Sir F. Bruce.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 13, 1865.

SIR: I am directed to call your attention to the fact that, pursuant to unofficial intelligence which has reached here, the insurgent ram Stonewall was recently anchored near the port of Nassau, after having captured at least one vessel of the United States on her way from Europe. According to another report, an United States schooner which had been captured by insurgents in Chesapeake Bay had reached another British island, and, though her restitution was asked for by the United States consul there, the request was refused by the authorities.

Assuming this information to be correct, the President of the United States is of the opinion that the time has now arrived when this government must expect those foreign powers which have hitherto recognized the piratical cruisers of the insurgents as entitled to belligerent rights in their ports and on the high seas to withdraw that recognition, and no longer to extend countenance and protection to those plunderers and burners of vessels of the United States. He hopes, also, that you may be authorized, and may deem yourself warranted by your knowledge of the present condition of affairs in this country, to instruct or request those officers of her Majesty's colonial possessions adjacent to the United States to refuse to receive vessels flying the flag of the insurgents.

I am instructed to add, however, that while disclaiming all intention of offering any threat, if it should not be competent for you to adopt the measures referred to, and those authorities should continue to welcome and grant hospitality to the vessels of the insurgents, or should not at once be checked in that course by the authorities at home, this government will deem itself warranted and compelled, with all reasonable courtesies, to adopt any course by which those vessels may be prevented from continuing their piratical ravages upon the commerce of the United States.

I have the honor to be, with high consideration, sir, your obedient servant,

W. HUNTER,
Acting Secretary.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK W. A. BRUCE, &c., &c., &c.

* For President's proclamation, printed under "Port Regulations" as an enclosure to Mr. Adams's dispatch to Mr. Seward, No. 973, June 2, 1865, *post*.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Hunter.

No. 960.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, May 18, 1865.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit a copy of the London Times of Tuesday, containing a report of the answers made by ministers in both houses to inquiries made respecting the withdrawal of the recognition of belligerent rights from the rebels. The argument is feeble enough in both cases; but as it makes now very little difference what may be the course taken, all that I can add is to regret that what would have appeared to be a manly and frank retraction of an originally hasty step had not been spontaneously offered in season to give it value in conciliating good feelings for the future.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM HUNTER,
Acting Secretary of State.

[For inclosed copy of report of debate see Parliamentary and Judicial Appendix, No. 6.]

Mr. Adams to Mr. Hunter.

[Extract.]

No. 963.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, May 25, 1865.

SIR: * * * * *

In relation to the question of belligerent rights, it appears that so far as it refers to the restriction upon the sojourn of our national vessels in the ports of foreign powers, it was withdrawn in this kingdom, as I notified you, at the close of the last week, and it has this week been removed also in France. That settles one of the points in dispute.

The other point, the recognition of belligerency, is made to depend upon the renunciation by the United States government of the right of search of neutral vessels at sea. As the exercise of this appears to be no longer necessary, it cannot be doubted that this will be soon disposed of likewise.

At the same time, and in order to put an end to all further hesitation, if the matter be not already provided for by the voluntary surrender of the parties, it would seem to be advisable for the government to take early steps to obtain possession by force of the only remaining outlets for illicit commerce—Galveston and the line of the Rio Grande.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM HUNTER,
Acting Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Hunter.

No. 964.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, May 25, 1865.

SIR: I now have the honor to transmit a copy of my reply, dated the 20th, to Lord Russell's note of the 4th instant, which I have already, in

my No. 952, mentioned as being in preparation. After it was completed, owing to its great length, it took several days to make the necessary fair copies for transmission to his lordship, as well as to you. I am in hopes that it will dispose of the subject, at least for some time to come.

Lord Russell, on the 22d instant, sent me an acknowledgment of the receipt of it, as will appear by the copy herewith transmitted.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM HUNTER,
Acting Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, May 20, 1865.

MY LORD: I have had the honor to receive your note of the 4th instant in reply to mine of the 7th of last month. I have already taken the earliest opportunity to transmit a copy to my government.

If it should not so happen that the course of events dispose of the matter beforehand, I shall probably receive instructions which will enable me to give the information which your lordship appears to desire. Pending the receipt of these, however, I must ask pardon for observing that in the notice which you have been pleased to take of the argument submitted in my note, you have so far extended the field of discussion as to make it my duty to proceed in it still further. And here I would beg leave to remark that if I am to judge of the general statement made of my position by the abstract of it presented to me by your lordship, I must have very grievously failed in offering the logical sequence of my propositions as distinctly as I had desired to do.

This will render necessary another effort to place them before you in the following brief recapitulation:

It was my wish to maintain—

1. That the act of recognition by her Majesty's government of insurgents as belligerents on the high seas before they had a single vessel afloat was precipitate and unprecedented.
2. That it had the effect of creating these parties belligerents after the recognition, instead of merely acknowledging an existing fact.
3. That this creation has been since effected exclusively from the ports of her Majesty's kingdom and its dependencies, with the aid and co-operation of her Majesty's subjects.
4. That during the whole course of the struggle in America, of nearly four years in duration; there has been no appearance of the insurgents as a belligerent on the ocean excepting in the shape of British vessels, constructed, equipped, supplied, manned, and armed in British ports.
5. That during the same period it has been the constant and persistent endeavor of my government to remonstrate in every possible form against this abuse of the neutrality of this kingdom, and to call upon her Majesty's government to exercise the necessary powers to put an effective stop to it.
6. That, although the desire of her Majesty's ministers to exert themselves in the suppression of these abuses is freely acknowledged, the efforts which they made proved in a great degree powerless, from the inefficiency of the law on which they relied, and from their absolute refusal, when solicited, to procure additional powers to attain the object.

7. That, by reason of the failure to check this flagrant abuse of neutrality, the issue from British ports of a number of British vessels, with the aid of the recognition of their belligerent character in all the ports of her Majesty's dependencies around the globe, has resulted in the burning and destroying on the ocean a large number of merchant vessels and a very large amount of property belonging to the people of the United States.

8. That, in addition to this direct injury, the action of these British-built, manned, and armed vessels has had the indirect effect of driving from the sea a large portion of the commercial marine of the United States, and to a corresponding extent enlarging that of Great Britain, thus enabling one portion of the British people to derive an unjust advantage from the wrong committed on a friendly nation by another portion.

9. That the injuries thus received by a country which has meanwhile sedulously endeavored to perform all its obligations, owing to the imperfection of the legal means at hand to prevent them, as well as the unwillingness to seek for more stringent powers, are of so grave a nature as in reason and justice to constitute a valid claim for reparation and indemnification.

In making this recapitulation, it is no part of my design to go over any of the reasoning which has already been exhausted in the correspondence which I have had the honor heretofore to hold with your lordship. I shall endeavor to confine myself to such points as may have been raised by the new matter embodied in the note to which I now have the honor to reply.

With regard to my first proposition, I have ventured to affirm that the recognition of the insurgents as belligerents on the 13th of May was precipitate and unprecedented.

That it was precipitate is clear from the fact that not a single vessel entitled to the character was at that moment afloat on the ocean, and that even on the land the war itself had barely commenced in the bloodless capture of Fort Sumter.

That it was unprecedented, I must infer that your lordship does not design to dispute, since it appears that you have not availed yourself of my invitation to furnish me with any example.

Nevertheless, I have endeavored, so far as I was able myself, to investigate the matter, in order that I might be fully satisfied in regard to the solidity of the reasons which your lordship has done me the favor to offer for so suddenly taking this step. I have found in history an abundance of instances of insurrections either temporarily or ultimately successful. In most of them there was much more of necessity pressing upon neutral powers for deciding the points to which your lordship has referred in your note; but I have failed to discover a single occasion upon which any of the powers made a decision in anticipation of a case of immediate necessity presenting itself to their attention.

In this connection I may perhaps be pardoned for reminding your lordship of the circumstances connected with the breaking out of the revolution in the British colonies in America. It could not then be said that cruisers and merchant vessels did not at once swarm on the ocean; neither was the other contingency absent of the decision of her Majesty's government to close some ports and to blockade others. Yet I do not perceive that France, however well inclined to do so, did actually take a single step to declare, by proclamation, these insurgents as belligerents at any time. The course which it did take, the same which I find to have been usual, was to await the arrival of an insurgent vessel in her ports. When that event did happen, a decision was made. It was

received as belonging to a belligerent. The same course was likewise taken in Holland. But I must beg leave to remind your lordship that even this quiet proceeding was instantly denounced by her Majesty's government in both cases as a wrong, demanding reparation, and was made one of several grounds for which, in the end, Great Britain made war successively against each nation.

But the immediate recognition of the insurgents by a proclamation was not the only unprecedented proceeding resorted to by her Majesty's government to create a status which had no actual existence.

In advance of that step it now appears that measures were taken, and overtures made, to effect a species of diplomatic negotiation with the so-called authorities at Richmond for the purpose of gaining their adhesion to the four points of the celebrated treaty of 1856. Considering that the party applied to had not then, and has not at any moment since, ever been able to boast of sailing a single vessel of its own construction, equipment, and manning, this might very naturally have been construed by it as equivalent to offering to create for it a status in the ports of the proposing party, applying in advance of any idea of profiting by such a privilege. I do not intend to affirm that her Majesty's government, in taking this extraordinary step, had any design to hold forth an invitation. On the contrary, I disclaim any such idea. But it must be obvious to your lordship that some responsibility is often incurred for the injurious consequences naturally flowing from human action, even though there may not be the presence of evil intention. From the evidence already before the public, it does not admit of a doubt that these proceedings taken together did have the effect of encouraging the insurgents to a degree which led to the prosecution of their subsequent audacious policy.

The insurgents ultimately became a belligerent on the ocean solely by reason of the facilities furnished them in her Majesty's ports. The fact appears to me to be indisputable; for down to the close of the war, with the exception mentioned in my former note, of two passenger steamers stolen from the citizens of New York, not a single effective vessel of theirs has been seen on the ocean, excepting the six or seven which have been wholly supplied in and from this kingdom. Of the preparation of these steamers for the purpose indicated, I have endeavored from time to time to furnish your lordship with such evidence as I had it in my power to obtain. For a considerable time I found myself unable to stem the combined effect of the secret sympathy of her Majesty's officers in the port of Liverpool, and of your lordship's very natural incredulity based on their reports, in procuring more than formal attention to my representations.

Thus it was that the gunboat *Oreto* got away, and soon after became the armed privateer the *Florida*.

All the statements I had the honor to submit proved true to the letter, but, nevertheless, the facility with which the evasion had been accomplished furnished the strongest encouragement to the subsequent great extension of the field of operations.

It was at that moment that a deliberate policy was adopted by the insurgents, under which a base was made in this kingdom for all the extensive warlike operations since conducted by them. The officers were then established, and all the ramifications of a bureau regularly organized.

The next example was that of gunboat No. 290, afterwards well known as the cruiser the *Alabama*. I refer to this case once more only because it has been particularly referred to by your lordship. I do so for the

purpose of expressing my dissent from the statement made in your note in regard to certain important particulars.

Your lordship is pleased to state that the papers affording evidence of a design to equip this ship for the confederate service were furnished to you on the 22d and on the 24th of July. This is certainly true. But your lordship will be kind enough to remember that my first note giving information as to the character of that vessel was dated on the 23d of June—that is, one month preceding. On the 4th of July the commissioners of her Majesty's customs, to whom that representation was referred, made a report admitting the fact that the vessel was certainly built for a ship of war, but affirming that the evidence presented of her being intended for the so-called confederate government was not sufficient to justify a detention. The concluding sentence in their letter was in these words; I pray permission to ask your lordship's particular attention to them:

"We beg to add that the officers at Liverpool *will keep a strict watch upon the vessel*, and that any further information that may be obtained concerning her will be forthwith reported."

Here was a distinct pledge on the part of two of her Majesty's officers that "they would keep a strict watch on this vessel," which pledge was sent to me with your lordship's note of the 4th of July, requesting me to obtain such further evidence as might tend to show the destination of the vessel. Considering this as a distinct engagement, sanctioned by her Majesty's government, to keep faithful watch over that vessel so long as it might be necessary to obtain more evidence as to her character, the precise date of the receipt of that evidence becomes a question of secondary importance. The true question appears to be, how that pledge was actually redeemed. This will appear clear enough in the sequel. On the 9th of July the consul made a statement to the collector of facts as they had become known to him.

He entered into a number of details in respect to the persons engaged in connection with this vessel, naming individuals with a particularity certainly deserving of some investigation by her Majesty's officers at Liverpool if they really meant to satisfy themselves that she ought to be detained. But it does not appear that they considered it their duty to initiate, or even to carry on, any inquiry.

The board of customs contented themselves with a formal reply on the 15th instant, denying that there was sufficient *prima facie* evidence to justify a seizure of the vessels.

On the other hand, my lord, I must take the liberty to remark, after a calm re-examination of the substance of that letter, that if there was not *prima facie* evidence enough in it to justify the seizure, there was matter enough in it to make it the bounden duty of her Majesty's officers to lose no time and omit no effort to obtain the evidence on their own account to verify or to disprove the allegations.

They do not so appear to have read their duty. The consequence was, that more time was necessary for me to procure the information which, as officers of the Crown, they admit in their own letter they ought to have procured themselves. I did obtain evidence, though the process naturally consumed time. That evidence was submitted on the 21st of July by the consul at Liverpool to the collector of that port, and by him referred to the board of customs. The deliberate answer of that body was made on the 23d of July, and it was to the effect that it was *not* sufficient to justify any steps being taken against the vessel under the law.

Thus far it appears that although her Majesty's officers had pledged

the government to "keep faithful watch over the vessel and report any further information they might obtain," no one of them seems to have been disposed to pay the smallest attention to any representations or any evidence offered by myself or any agent of the United States, even so far as to stimulate his own action in any way whatever. A change now took place, to the nature of which I beg most particularly to call your lordship's attention.

On the next day after the decision of the customs board I had the honor of sending to your lordship copies of six of the very same depositions which had been already sent to them. Whether these would by themselves have met with a better fate, I cannot venture to pronounce. But on the 24th I transmitted two additional ones, to which was appended a professional opinion by a British subject, distinguished as a Queen's counsel, which had been given to me after a careful examination of all these papers. It was to the following effect:

1. "That if the collector of Liverpool did not detain the vessel he would incur a heavy responsibility, of which the board of customs must take their share.

2. "That if the vessel was allowed to escape, it deserved consideration whether the federal government would not have serious ground of remonstrance."

These were ominous words. They laid the responsibility distinctly upon the very parties who had given the original pledge of vigilance and attention. And yet, during the very interval in which her Majesty's government was deliberating upon their purport, the vessel was permitted to escape. Neither did this event occur without most explicit warning of the danger having been given by a person acting on behalf of the United States. As early as the 23d of July, six days before that escape, Mr. Squarry, the solicitor employed in the case, addressed a note to the secretary of the customs board warning them most distinctly of the fact that the vessel was ready for sea, had fifty men on board, and could sail any time. On the 26th he wrote another letter, repeating the warning once more. Yet in spite of the promise to keep a strict watch, and in spite of these repeated warnings, the vessel was permitted to steam out of Liverpool just as if no cause of suspicion of her destination had ever been excited. And, as if to crown the extraordinary character of the transaction, after receiving from Mr. Squarry notice on the 29th that the vessel was actually gone, it was not until the 31st that telegrams were issued to Liverpool ordering her detention. I must respectfully represent to your lordship that this proceeding, so far from appearing to do any justice to the demand of the United States, looks almost as if it were intended for a positive insult.

It is true that on the same day telegrams ordering a detention were sent to Cork; likewise, on the 1st of August, to Beaumaris and Holyhead. And on the 2d of August a letter was sent to the collector at Cork to the same effect. For all practical purposes, they might have been sent just as well at this moment that I am addressing these lines to your lordship. It further appears that instructions were sent to the governor of the Bahamas, in case the vessel should visit Nassau. The vessel did not visit that place. But the next time she visited a port within her Majesty's dominions was after she had entered upon her career of depredation; and then, instead of being detained, she was politely received and acknowledged as the vessel of a *bona fide* belligerent.

It now appears that from the day when, by the flagrant negligence of her Majesty's board of customs, this vessel, admitted to be intended for war purposes, was suffered to depart from the port of Liverpool,

down to the hour of her destruction by the United States steamer *Kear*-*surge* off the coast of France, she came again and again into ports within her Majesty's jurisdiction, and instead of being treated as her Majesty's government directed if she should go to Nassau, she was everywhere hailed with joy and treated with hospitality as a legitimate cruiser.

On behalf of my government I respectfully protest against the whole of this proceeding as contrary to recognized principles of international law. What the obligation of her Majesty's government really was in this instance is so clearly laid down by a distinguished writer, notoriously disposed never to exaggerate the duties nor to undervalue the privileges of neutrals, that I will ask the liberty to lay before you his very words:

"Le fait de construire un bâtiment de guerre pour le compte d'un belligérant, ou de l'armer dans les états neutres, est une violation du territoire. Toutes les prises faites par un bâtiment de cette nature sont illégitimes, en quelque lieu qu'elles aient été faites. Le souverain offensé a le droit de s'en emparer, même de force, si elles sont amenées dans ses ports, et d'en réclamer la restitution lorsqu'elles sont, comme cela arrive en général, conduites dans les ports hors de sa juridiction. Il peut également réclamer le désarmement du bâtiment illégalement armé sur son territoire, et même le détenir, s'il entre dans quelque lieu soumis à sa souveraineté jusqu'à ce qu'il ait été désarmé."^{*}

It is, then, with undoubting confidence in the justice of the reasoning here presented that I take the liberty to reaffirm the validity of the claims of my government for all the damage done by this vessel during her career, and ask reparation therefor.

With respect to the extract from the letter of Mr. Seward to me of August 13, 1863, actually written in 1862, (by a clerical error in your lordship's note that for a time misled me,) which you are pleased to quote as a proof that he was perfectly satisfied with the proceedings, I can only remark that the very date itself sufficiently proves that his language never could have been intended to apply to the extent to which your lordship appears to suppose; for at that moment he had been but very partially put in possession of all the facts connected with the case. His remark obviously pointed only to the disposition of your lordship, which has never been brought into question. What he has thought of the whole case since, and what instructions have been given to me in consequence, are matters too well known to your lordship to render further explanation necessary.

Passing from this point to the more general question between the two countries, I proceed to the task of considering an argument of your lordship of a widely different description. This is one drawn entirely from the authority supplied by the previous practice of the government which I have the honor to represent. You cite this as an example to sustain the position taken by her Majesty's government against the present claim. It is urged in at least two instances cited, where similar claims were presented by the representatives of foreign powers to the United States, they were replied to with substantially the same reasoning now repeated by her Majesty's government. These are the cases of Spain and Portugal, the commerce of which countries had suffered from depre-

* "The fact of building a war vessel for a belligerent, or of arming it in neutral states, is a violation of the territory. All captures made by a vessel of this kind, in whatever place they may be made, are illegal. The offended sovereign has the right to seize them even by force, if they are brought into his ports, and to claim the restoration of them if carried into ports beyond his jurisdiction, as is generally the case. He may also exact the disarming of the vessel illegally armed within his territory, and even retain it till disarmed, if it enters any place subject to his power."—*Translation*.

dations on the ocean, committed by vessels built, armed, manned, and equipped by citizens of the United States and dispatched from their ports.

The first remark that I would pray permission to submit in connection with this view of the subject is this: that even if it were true that the government of the United States had, half a century since, refused to recognize the just claims of other powers for damage done by reason of their omission to prevent the abuse of their neutral ports to the commerce of those powers, it could in no degree change the nature of any subsequent omission or neglect committed by other powers at this day. It is a principle of morals too thoroughly known to your lordship to require my dwelling upon it for a moment, that the wrong-doing of one party cannot be cited in justification of a repetition of the act by another.

Surely if the United States government had ventured upon declaring what was once known as a paper blockade of the whole southern coast, her Majesty's government would not have been content to be told that such was the acknowledged practice of Great Britain many years ago. Neither would it have been better satisfied if the United States had resorted to the press-gangs in the outset of the war to fill their ships with British subjects, forced against their will to fight their own countrymen in the Alabamas, and Floridas, and Shenandoahs, and Tallahassees, depredating on the ocean, to be told, in answer to their remonstrances, that just such was the treatment Americans experienced at the hands of Great Britain prior to the war of 1812.

But, conclusive as this reasoning may be held to be to annul at once all the authority that springs from mere precedent as its source, I am by no means disposed to resort to it in the cases cited by your lordship. They are very familiar to me, and to my view are in themselves so far from furnishing strength to the positions which have been taken by your lordship, that they bear directly the contrary way. The parallel attempted to be drawn is, in other words, wholly defective and inapplicable.

In regard to the injuries inflicted by citizens of the United States upon the commerce of Spain, the extract which your lordship is pleased to quote from the official note of the representative of the latter country, Don Louis de Onis, certainly does show that such were actually committed. I am not aware that the government of the United States ever denied the fact. The expedition fitted out by General Miranda against a certain portion of the coast of South America, then under Spanish rule, was unquestionably a violation of the neutrality of the country, which ought to have been prevented. All these cases constituted claims which the Spanish government held against the United States, very much in the same way that the claims for damage done by the Alabama, &c., issued from British ports, are now held by the United States. On the other hand, however, it should be observed that out of the wars of Europe there had grown up a much larger amount of claims on behalf of the people of the United States for injuries done to their commerce by illegal seizure and condemnation of their vessels in the ports of Spain. In progress of time the necessity became urgent on both sides to enter into a deliberate examination of these respective claims, and, if possible, to arrive at fair terms of settlement. A plan of a treaty was proposed embracing all that was regarded as fairly to be brought forward on the two sides. It was during this process that Don Louis de Onis, the very same person whom your lordship has been pleased to cite as making the complaint, himself, on the 24th of October, 1818, pre-

sented a *projet* of six articles, intended to include every one of those objects.

There can be no doubt that this proposal was intended to cover the very claim which was presented in the previous note of January, 1817, an extract from which your lordship has done me the honor to quote. If your lordship should have any inclination to draw it into question, I shall only have to refer you to a second *projet* presented by the same individuals on the 16th of November, 1818, in which occur these words:

"My fourth proposal to your government has for its object the renunciation by both governments and nations of *all* claims for spoliations respectively suffered by either of the two powers or their subjects until the signing of the treaty."

And as a voucher for what was meant, there is attached to this paper a document containing three separate lists—one, of the names of the Spanish vessels taken; another, of the privateers, fitted out in the American ports, by which they were taken; and a third, of the property taken in those vessels. In other words, these constitute the very claims for injuries complained of in the note of Mr. Onís, to which your lordship has been pleased to refer. To this proposition, so presented by Mr. Onís, the government of the United States raised no objection. It was, therefore, so far as it went, admitted as an item *pro tanto* on the side of Spain in the settlement of the opposite questions between the two nations. As such, it was incorporated into the *projet* of a treaty drawn up by Don Louis de Onís for the consideration of the United States government, and delivered on the 9th of February, 1819. In this paper it makes a portion of the tenth article.

The renunciation of his Majesty was made to extend to all injuries caused by the expedition of Miranda, fitted out and equipped at New York, and "to all claims of subjects of his Catholic Majesty upon the government of the United States in which the interposition of his Catholic Majesty's government has been solicited before the date of this treaty and since the date of the convention of 1802, or which may have been made to the department of foreign affairs of his Majesty or to his minister in the United States."

It is not to be supposed for a moment that in making this voluntary offer the Spanish government did not expect to gain for it a just equivalent in settling the other and less favorable terms of the treaty.

This offer, so made, was accepted by Mr. Adams for the United States and incorporated in his counter project, offered to Don Louis de Onís on the 13th of February, 1819. It therefore now stands *totidem verbis* as a part of the treaty signed by the representatives of the two countries on the 22d of February of that year. All the papers from which these extracts are taken have been long before the world. I trust I may therefore be pardoned if I express no small astonishment that your lordship should have fallen into the error of affirming, in the note which I have had the honor to receive, that "it does not appear that any compensation was ever made for any of the seizures."

I now ask leave to proceed to the consideration of the other case referred to in your lordship's note, the claim of Portugal upon the United States for similar injuries to those complained of on behalf of Spain. I am the more disposed to approach the subject, that, unlike the other case, it is new in the correspondence which it has been my duty to hold with your lordship, and that it gives me an opportunity to correct some misapprehensions which appear to exist as to its true character and bearings on the present discussion.

The extracts from various public papers of the government of the

United States with which your lordship has favored me sufficiently establish the fact as stated, to wit: "That the revolutionary movement in South America excited the sympathy of the people of the United States."

Your lordship is pleased here to apply the parallel so far as to admit that in this kingdom there was similar sympathy with "the people of the southern States" in what you describe as "their endeavors to give these States an independent position in the world." This was an unfortunate illusion as to the true objects of that struggle, of which I have been aware, but which I have never ceased to regret.

Yet I would respectfully call the attention of your lordship to the circumstance, in connection with this supposed parallel, that notwithstanding the sympathy of the people of the United States with South America, and notwithstanding that the insurgents did possess both open ports and abundant facilities for cruising on the ocean, the government of the United States did not herald their movement by a prompt declaration recognizing these people as a belligerent power as against Spain.

So far was this from being true, that no sooner was it known that movements were set on foot to make a few of the ports of the United States a base for the operations of the insurgents, aided by citizens of the country, than orders were given to the proper officers of the government to apply the whole power of the existing laws to prevent it. In proof of this assertion I pray permission to submit the reports of the prosecuting attorneys for the two districts in which the offenses were most committed. Copies of these papers will be found appended to this note. They will show that seven different individuals, citizens of Spanish America, engaged in these operations against the neutrality of the country, were subjected to trial for their offenses in the courts. I would here beg leave to interpose the remark, that, so far as I know, in spite of all the evidence which I have presented to your lordship as to the complicity of leading insurgents of the United States, residing in this kingdom, in the violations of neutrality here committed, not a single prosecution has ever been attempted by her Majesty's government. They will also show that the only limit to the effort of the government to punish the parties concerned was the inefficiency of the provisions of the existing laws passed in 1794. It was this difficulty which soon forced itself upon the attention of the President.

It is here that I beg leave to take up the case of Portugal, and to ask attention to those particular points in which the action of the United States in this case differs most materially from that of her Majesty's government, with which it has been attempted to make a parallel.

On the 20th of December M. J. Correa de Serra, the diplomatic representative of Portugal at Washington, addressed a note to Mr. Monroe, then the Secretary of State, presenting the particulars of a strong case of violation of the law which had just happened in Baltimore. He proceeded frankly to acquit the government of any want of disposition to punish the offense and to mention the obstacle which he designated to be the imperfection of the statute law. I pray your lordship's permission to cite the passage, which explains the nature of the request he made in consequence:

"I apply, therefore, to this government in the present instance not to raise altercations, or to require satisfaction, which the Constitution of the United States has not, perhaps, enabled them to give; because I know that the supreme Executive of this nation, all-powerful when supported by law, is constitutionally inactive when unsupported by it. What I solicit of him is the proposition to Congress of such provisions by law as will prevent such attempts for the future. I am persuaded that my

maganimous sovereign will receive a more dignified satisfaction, and worthier of his high character, by the enactment of such laws by the United States, which, insuring the respect due to his flag for the future, would show their regard for his Majesty, than in the punishment of a few obscure offenders, (even if attainable) who, disowned as they are by the United States, may, no doubt, if they take any unwarrantable liberty with the property of his Majesty's subjects, meet the fate every honest mind wishes to them, and serve as examples and warnings to those who, in future, may feel piratical dispositions. I rely on the President's wisdom—and the wish I am sure he must feel of putting an end to these shameful practices—that he will take the proper measures to have my requisition fulfilled."

This was on the 20th of December. Only six days elapsed after the reception of this application when Mr. Madison, then the President, addressed a message to both houses of Congress in the following words:

"It is found that the existing laws have not the efficacy necessary to prevent violations of the obligations of the United States as a nation at peace toward belligerent parties, and other unlawful acts on the high seas, by armed vessels equipped within the waters of the United States. With a view to maintain more effectually the respect due to the laws, to the character, and to the neutral and pacific relations of the United States, I recommend to the consideration of Congress the expediency of such further legislative provisions as may be requisite for detaining vessels actually equipped or in course of equipment, with a warlike force, within the jurisdiction of the United States; or, as the case may be, for obtaining from the owners or commanders of such vessels adequate securities against the abuse of their armaments, with the exceptions in such provisions proper for the cases of merchant vessels furnished with the defensive armament usual on distant and dangerous expeditions, and of a private commerce in military stores, permitted by our laws, and which the law of nations does not require the United States to prohibit."

The precise points which he desired to have incorporated into a statute are specified in a note from the Secretary of State to Mr. Forsyth, chairman of Committee on Foreign Relations. They are these:

"Having communicated to you, verbally, the information asked for by your letter of the 1st instant, except so far as it relates to the last inquiry it contains, I have now the honor to state that the provisions necessary to make the laws effectual against fitting out armed vessels in our ports, for the purpose of hostile cruising, seem to be—

"1. That they should be laid under bond not to violate the treaties of the United States under the law of nations, in all cases where there is reason to suspect such a purpose on foot, including the cases of vessels taking on board arms and munitions of war, applicable to the equipment and armament of such vessels subsequent to their departure.

"2. To invest the collectors, or other revenue officers where there are no collectors, with power to seize and detain vessels under circumstances indicating strong presumption of an intended breach of the law—the detention to take place until the order of the Executive, on a full representation of the facts had thereupon, can be obtained. The statute-book contains analogous powers to this above suggested." (See particularly the 11th section of the act of Congress of April 25, 1808.)

"The existing laws do not go to this extent. They do not authorize the demand of security in any shape, or any interposition on the part of the magistracy as a preventive when there is reason to suspect an intention to commit the offense. They rest upon the general footing of punishing the offense merely where, if there be full evidence of the actual

perpetration of the crime, the party is handed over, after the trial, to the penalty denounced."

Experience, both in America and in this kingdom, has united to prove that the measure of restraint here pointed out is almost the only effective one which can be resorted to in such cases. Had it been found possible to use it here, I am confident that a great portion of the difficulties experienced by her Majesty's government during the late war would have been avoided. On the 3d of March, 1817, a temporary law was passed to meet the emergency, which was received by the Portuguese minister with the greatest satisfaction.

On the 8th of March, 1818, the Portuguese envoy addressed a representation to the Secretary of State in regard to the capture of three vessels by one of these illegal cruisers. But it should be particularly noted that these cases appear all to have grown out of depredations committed by a single vessel which had escaped from the United States previous to the date of the enactment of the new statute. The captures themselves took place on the ocean at about the time of its passage.

With the aid of this explanation your lordship will be better able to appreciate the force of the language of Mr. Adams, then the Secretary of State, in his reply to the Portuguese minister, which you have done me the honor to quote in your note. The government had not only literally done all in its power under existing laws to prevent these violations of neutrality, but had, at the request of the envoy himself, procured the adoption by Congress of a new and more stringent statute. Surely under such circumstance nothing more could reasonably be expected of it.

This seems to have been the opinion of the Portuguese minister himself. So well satisfied was he with the practical operation of this law in checking these enterprises, that, at the moment when it was about to expire by its own limitation of two years, (on the 4th of February, 1819,) he once more came forth to express his anxiety about losing it, and addressed an urgent representation to the United States government to secure an extension of the time. The reply was to the effect that it had not only been incorporated into a new and improved form, but was made permanent. This will appear from the following note from Mr. Adams:

"SIR: In answer to your letter of the 4th instant, I have the honor of informing you that the act of Congress of 3d March, 1817, to which it refers, was repealed by the act of the 20th of April last, entitled 'An act in addition to the act for the punishment of certain crimes against the United States, and to repeal the acts therein mentioned, being the eighth chapter of the laws of the last session.' On referring to this last-mentioned statute, which is not of limited duration, you will find that the provisions of the temporary act of 3d March, 1817, are re-enacted by it."

From all which proceedings it distinctly appears that although there were some violations of neutrality committed in defiance of every precaution, both before and afterwards, yet the position of the United States in regard to every complaint was an impregnable one. It has done everything in its power, not only to execute existing laws, but to provide more stringent and satisfactory enactments to remedy the defects of the old ones. Had her Majesty's government in its wisdom decided to do as much as this in the late war, I am not sure that I should have been able to resist the argument drawn from the example your lordship has cited in its defense. But I regret to be obliged to remind you that, so far was this from being the case, it took diametrically the opposite

course. At an early period my government, not unaware of the obstacles that were presenting themselves to the effective application of the existing statutes of Great Britain to the offenses notoriously committed within this kingdom, directed me to call your lordship's attention to the expediency of procuring for the government more stringent provisions. I did then venture respectfully to propose to you that some steps should be taken to obtain at least such modifications of the existing enlistment act as might tend to make it a better preventive measure. Your lordship was pleased, in the first instance, to respond favorably, at least so far as to make the adoption of such amendments conditional upon corresponding and simultaneous action on the part of the United States. But no sooner had I succeeded in obtaining from my government its assent to a consideration of the arrangement and communicated the result to you, than, your lordship will be so good as to recollect, that I received for answer that her Majesty's government had in the interval reconsidered its decision, and had finally determined to rely upon the existing statutes as quite effective to answer the desired purpose.

From this survey of the two cases it must, then, be obvious that the parallel which your lordship has attempted is by no means to be regarded as complete, inasmuch as in the one instance everything that was required as security by a foreign power was actually done to please it, while in the other everything required was as positively declined. Hence the responsibility for the evil consequences, which was lifted by its own action from the one party, seems to have been entailed with renewed force, by its refusal to act, upon the other.

Your lordship is pleased to observe that you can never admit that the duties of Great Britain towards the United States are to be measured by the losses which the trade and commerce of the United States may have sustained; to which I would ask permission to reply that no such rule was ever desired. The true standard for the measurement would seem to be framed on the basis of the clear obligations themselves, and the losses that spring from the imperfect performance of them. With regard to the observations of your lordship respecting the seizure, by her Majesty's government, of the two steam war vessels constructed by Mr. Laird, at Liverpool, I have at all times endeavored to bear my feeble testimony to the earnest desire then manifested to put a stop to that most outrageous of all the attempts that have been made to violate the neutrality of this kingdom. At the same time, however, since your lordship has been pleased to open that subject, it is no more than my duty to observe that the proceeding does not appear to have terminated as, in accordance with her Majesty's dignity, I am compelled to think it should have done, in fully upholding the authority of the sovereign power, but rather in a necessity to resort to an indirect mode of escaping the hazard of recourse to the ordinary process of the courts for the protection due to a foreign nation. So far as the claims of the government of the United States are concerned, it matters little by what means the end may have been reached. At the same time it is impossible for it not to have been made painfully conscious in the process that the security of the peace of the two nations, from one of the most flagrant violations of international obligations ever attempted, should have been left to hang upon a mode of proceeding wholly foreign from the recognized and established law of the land.

The fact of the extraordinary decline of the mercantile navigation of the United States simultaneously with a corresponding increase of that of Great Britain, as shown in the tables appended to my former note, does not appear to be disputed by your lordship. Nor yet the other fact that

it sprang from the transfer of vessels from the one side to the other by reason of the ravages committed by armed steamers fitted out from the ports of Great Britain. It is true your lordship is pleased to avoid the natural inference which I have been compelled to draw from this state of things by explaining the process in another way. You are pleased to affirm it is a fact that "it has been common to transfer American merchant ships without a change of cargo or crew nominally to British owners, in order to avoid the higher rates of insurance payable during the war." But in reply to this I would remark, in the first place, that even if this statement be correct to a far greater extent than I should at present be disposed to admit, it is nothing less than a direct fraud on one of the belligerents, which if it had had native vigor, instead of being an unthrifty offshoot from a purely British stock, would have furnished to it just ground for general retribution upon British commerce by subjugating it to the most annoying suspicion and severe examination. And in the next, that the very fact of the admitted rise in the rates of insurance on American ships only brings us once more back to look at the original cause of all the trouble, to wit: the fact of the issue of all the depredating vessels from British ports with British seamen, and with, in all respects but the presence of a few men acting as officers, a purely British character.

Thus it is that whatever may be the line of argument I pursue, I am compelled ever to return to the one conclusion. The nation that recognized a power as a belligerent before it had built a vessel and became itself the sole source of all the belligerent character it has ever possessed on the ocean, must be regarded as responsible for all the damage that has ensued from that cause to the commerce of a power with which it was under the most sacred of obligations to preserve amity and peace.

There remain a few minor points in your lordship's note which might have elicited further comments on my part, but for the consideration that the positions taken in regard to them by my government have been already on a former occasion sufficiently set forth. I am therefore reluctant, by further extending this note, to run the risk of trespassing unnecessarily on your lordship's patience. I trust that, in performing the task to which my sense of duty calls me, I shall not be found to have in any degree transgressed the limits of amicable discussion to which it is the earnest desire of my government that I should ever adhere, and which it is always my own disposition to observe.

I pray your lordship to accept the assurances of the highest consideration with which I have the honor to be, my lord, your lordship's most obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

Lord Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, May 22, 1865.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the letter which you addressed to me on the 20th instant, in reply to mine of the 4th, and to state to you that the observations therein contained will be duly considered by her Majesty's government.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 7, 1865, p. 1.]

No. 1.

Sir F. Bruce to Earl Russell.

WASHINGTON, May 26, 1865.

MY LORD: I have the honor to inclose herewith a proclamation opening to foreign trade the ports on the seaboard of the United States, with the exception of those in Texas, after the 1st of July. The delay of a month is required in order to reorganize the customs establishments at the ports.

Two considerations will operate strongly in the restoration of unrestricted commerce with the southern States. The rebellion having been suppressed, the North seeks for compensation for the sacrifices it has made in trade with those regions, and demands the cessation of the abuses and favoritism which have characterized the system of trading under treasury permits, which was initiated during the war.

Moreover, the introduction of northern capital and energy will give employment to the southern people, who are now starving, and it is hoped will tend to develop the resources of the States, and thus promote the restoration of tranquillity.

I feel convinced that in a short time all attempts to impose restrictions on trade in any shape will be found impracticable.

The South is destitute of everything, and the government is obliged to issue rations in many places to prevent the people from dying of famine.

In order to induce the people to resume cultivation, and to enable them to provide for themselves, it is necessary that the holders of cotton in the plantations should be induced to bring it to market by withdrawing the threat of seizure, and it appears to me that vague threats of confiscation of property cannot be kept hanging over the heads of the proprietors in general. An amnesty which shall reassure the masses cannot be long withheld.

The clause in the proclamation stating that persons trading with the ports of the United States in violation of the laws will be regarded as pirates is, to me, unintelligible, nor can I obtain any satisfactory explanation of it. I think it is inserted *in terrorem*, as such offenses must be dealt with according to law, and no tribunal would consider persons guilty of such acts as guilty of piracy.

I have, &c.,

FREDERICK W. A. BRUCE.

[Inclosure.]

By the President of the United States of America.

A PROCLAMATION.

Whereas, by the proclamation of the President, of the eleventh day of April last, certain ports of the United States therein specified, which had previously been subject to blockade, were, for objects of public safety, declared, in conformity with previous special legislation of Congress, to be closed against foreign commerce during the national will,

to be thereafter expressed and made known by the President; and whereas events and circumstances have since occurred which, in my judgment, render it expedient to remove that restriction, except as to the ports of Galveston, La Salle, Brazos de Santiago, (Point Isabel,) and Brownsville, in the State of Texas:

Now, therefore, be it known, that I, Andrew Johnson, President of the United States, do hereby declare that the ports aforesaid not excepted as above shall be open to foreign commerce from and after the first day of July next; that commercial intercourse with the said ports may, from that time, be carried on, subject to the laws of the United States and in pursuance of such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury. If, however, any vessel from a foreign port shall enter any of the before-named excepted ports in the State of Texas, she will continue to be held liable to the penalties prescribed by the act of Congress approved on the thirteenth day of July, eighteen hundred and sixty-one, and the persons on board of her to such penalties as may be incurred pursuant to the laws of war for trading or attempting to trade with an enemy.

And I, Andrew Johnson, President of the United States, do hereby declare and make known that the United States of America do henceforth disallow to all persons trading or attempting to trade in any ports of the United States, in violation of the laws thereof, all pretense of belligerent rights and privileges; and I give notice that, from the date of this proclamation, all such offenders will be held and dealt with as pirates.

It is also ordered, that all restrictions upon trade heretofore imposed in the territory of the United States east of the Mississippi River, save those relating to contraband of war, to the reservation of the rights of the United States to property purchased in the territory of an enemy, and to the twenty-five per cent. upon the purchases of cotton, are removed. All provisions of the internal revenue law will be carried into effect under the proper officers.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington, this twenty-second day of May, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-five, and of the Independence of the United States of America the eighty-ninth.

[L. S.]

ANDREW JOHNSON.

By the President:

W. HUNTER, *Acting Secretary of State.*

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 10, 1865, p. 1.]

No. 1.

Earl Russell to Earl Cowley.

FOREIGN OFFICE, May 30, 1865.

MY LORD: Your excellency will have been enabled by my telegram of this morning to prepare M. Drouyn de Lhuys for the communication of the views of her Majesty's government as to the course which, in the present posture of affairs in the United States, may properly be adopted by the governments of England and France.

I have now to instruct your excellency to acquaint the French minister that her Majesty's government are of opinion that, after the capture

of the late president of the so-called Confederate States, and the surrender or dispersion, with one exception, of the armies hitherto kept in the field by those States, neutral nations have no alternative but to consider the civil war as at an end, and to shape their course accordingly.

It might, indeed, have been more satisfactory if the government of the United States had already in this condition of things formally renounced the exercise as regards neutrals of the rights of a belligerent; but the delay of any such renunciation on their part cannot be considered to afford sufficient warrant to neutral powers to continue to admit a belligerent character in a confederation of States which has been actually dissolved. Much embarrassment and complication in the relations between the United States and neutral powers could not fail to result from the perseverance of the latter in such a course, while no advantage could accrue to any party from it.

The government of the Emperor will probably view the matter in the same light; and under this impression her Majesty's government desire your excellency to propose that the two governments should agree at once to adopt the following measures, namely:

To declare, in the first place, that, having regard to the actual state of affairs, each government considers the war which has lately prevailed between the United States and the so-called Confederate States of North America to have ceased *de facto*, and on that ground they are prepared to recognize that peace has been restored within the whole territory of which the United States before the commencement of the civil war were in undisturbed possession.

2. And as a necessary consequence of such recognition, they mean to send, without delay, orders to the respective authorities in all ports, harbors, and waters belonging to each government, whether in Europe or beyond the seas, to refuse permission to any vessel of war carrying a confederate flag to enter any of the territorial waters, harbors, or ports of the respective governments. And

3. To require any confederate vessels of war which may have already entered the ports of the respective governments on the faith of proclamations of neutrality heretofore issued by such governments, and which, having complied with the provisions of such proclamations, may, at the time when the new orders reach the authorities of such ports, be actually within the territorial waters, ports, or harbors of such governments, forthwith to depart therefrom; on the understanding, however, that on the occasion of their departure the rule heretofore enforced in regard to the prohibition of pursuit within twenty-four hours by a cruiser of the United States, lying at the time within any such waters, ports, or harbors, shall then, and for the last time, be maintained in their favor. Her Majesty's government are of opinion that this last-mentioned mode of proceeding in regard to confederate vessels of war is required by a due regard for national good faith and honor, and they cannot anticipate any objection being made to it on the part of the government of the United States, when the ground on which it is adopted is explained to that government.

If the imperial government should concur in the course which I have thus sketched out, her Majesty's government will, for themselves, instruct her Majesty's minister at Washington to make it known, without delay, to the government of the United States, and will also communicate it to the minister of the United States in London; sending, at the same time, instructions to all British authorities in the ports of the United Kingdom, and in those of her Majesty's colonies and possessions beyond the seas, to act in conformity with it.

But her Majesty's government propose, in making this communication to the government of the United States, and to the minister of those States in London, to add that they have decided on the measures indicated, under the full persuasion that the government of the United States will, on their part, at once desist from exercising toward neutrals the right of blockade and of search, and detention of neutral vessels on the high seas, which can be lawfully exercised by belligerents alone, and which a power not engaged in warfare cannot, under the law of nations, assume to exercise.

Your excellency will inform me with as little delay as possible, and by telegraph, whether the French government concur in the course thus submitted for their consideration; and that no misapprehension may exist on the part of M. Drouyn de Lhuys as to the exact purport of the proposal, you will furnish him with a copy of this dispatch.

It is very desirable that the several steps required for carrying it into execution should be taken without delay. But I trust the French government will be able at once to concur in the measures now proposed.

I am, &c.,

RUSSELL.

[From the British Blue Book, "North America," No. 10, 1865, p. 2.]

No. 2.

Earl Cowley to Earl Russell.

[Extract.]

PARIS, May 31, 1865.

I waited upon M. Drouyn de Lhuys by appointment this afternoon, and after reading to him your lordship's dispatch of yesterday's date, proposing the withdrawal of the belligerent rights hitherto conceded by Great Britain and France to confederate cruisers, I placed a copy of it in his hands.

M. Drouyn de Lhuys said that having been made aware of the views of her Majesty's government by the Prince de la Tour d'Auvergne, he had already expressed through that ambassador his concurrence in their proposals, but he had suggested the addition of a further slight concession to such confederate vessels as might still find themselves in French or British ports, namely, that they might be disarmed and sold.

I asked M. Drouyn de Lhuys whether this additional concession might not give rise to difficulties with the United States. Might not the United States government state with reason that the war having been brought to an end by the complete discomfiture and surrender of the confederates, all property lately belonging to the latter reverted to the United States? It seemed to me that the power of selling ships lately in the confederate service must now be vested in the United States government.

M. Drouyn de Lhuys seemed to attach value to this observation.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 9, 1865, p. 1.]

No. 1.

Earl Russell to Sir F. Bruce.

FOREIGN OFFICE, June 2, 1861.

SIR: I received, on the 25th ultimo, your dispatch of the 10th ultimo, inclosing a copy, taken from a newspaper, of a proclamation issued by

the President of the United States on that day, declaring, among other matters, that "armed resistance to the authority of this government," namely, the government of the United States, "may be regarded as virtually at an end; and the persons by whom that resistance, as well as the operations of insurgent cruisers, were directed, are fugitives or captives."

On the day following the receipt of your dispatch intelligence reached this country of the capture of President Davis by the military forces of the United States

In this state of things her Majesty's government lost no time in communicating with the government of the Emperor of the French as to the course which should be pursued by the two governments; and while these communications were in progress I received officially from Mr. Adams, on the 30th ultimo, a copy of the President's proclamation of the 10th.

It would, indeed, have been more satisfactory if the government of the United States had accompanied the communication of the President's proclamation with a declaration that they formally renounced the exercise as regards neutrals of the rights of a belligerent; but her Majesty's government considered that, in the existing posture of affairs, the delay of any formal renunciation to that effect did not afford to neutral powers sufficient warrant for continuing to admit the possession of a belligerent character by a confederation of States which had been actually dissolved. The late president of the so-called Confederate States has been captured, and transported as a prisoner to Fort Monroe; the armies hitherto kept in the field by the Confederate States have, for the most part, surrendered or dispersed; and to continue to recognize those States as belligerents would not only be inconsistent with the actual condition of affairs, but might lead to much embarrassment and complication in the relations between neutral powers and the government of the United States.

Her Majesty's government have accordingly, after communication with the government of the Emperor of the French, determined to consider the war which has lately prevailed between the United States and the so-called Confederate States of North America to have ceased *de facto*; and, on that ground, they recognize the re-establishment of peace within the whole territory of which the United States, before the commencement of the civil war, were in undisturbed possession.

As a necessary consequence of this recognition, her Majesty's government will forthwith send to her Majesty's authorities in all ports, harbors, and waters belonging to her Majesty, whether in the United Kingdom or beyond the seas, orders henceforth to refuse admission into any such ports, harbors, and waters, of any vessel of war carrying a confederate flag, and to require any confederate vessels of war which, at the time that the orders may be received by her Majesty's authorities, may already have entered such ports, harbors, and waters, on the faith of proclamations heretofore issued by her Majesty, and which, having complied with the provisions of such proclamations, may be actually within such ports, harbors, and waters, forthwith to depart from the same.

But in adopting this decision as regards confederate vessels of war found within British ports, harbors, and waters when the orders are received by her Majesty's authorities, her Majesty's government consider that a due regard for national good faith and honor requires that her Majesty's authorities should be instructed that any confederate vessels of war so required to depart should, on their departure, have the benefit of the prohibition heretofore enforced against their being pursued within

twenty-four hours by a cruiser of the United States lying at the time within the same port, harbor, and waters, and that such prohibition should be then and for the last time maintained in favor of such confederate vessels of war.

Her Majesty's government cannot anticipate any objection being made by the government of the United States to this reserve, when the ground on which it is adopted is explained to that government.

Her Majesty's government have, however, thought it right to provide for the contingency of the commander of any confederate vessel of war which may be found in any port, harbor, or waters of her Majesty's dominions at the time when these new orders are received by her Majesty's authorities, or may enter such port, harbor, or waters within a month after these new orders are received, desiring to divest his vessel of her warlike character, and to assume the flag of any nation recognized by her Majesty's government as in a state of peace with her Majesty; and in such a case her Majesty's authorities will be authorized to allow the commander of the vessel to do so, and, after disarming her, to remain without a confederate flag within British waters, at his own risk in all respects; in which case such commander will be distinctly apprised that he is to expect no further protection from her Majesty's government, except such as he may be entitled to in the ordinary course of the administration of the law in time of peace. The rule as to twenty-four hours would not be applicable to the case of such vessel.

I have to instruct you to lose no time in making known to the government of the United States, by communicating to the Secretary of State a copy of this dispatch, the course of action on which her Majesty's government have decided, and which they doubt not will be agreeable to the government of the United States. But in making this communication to the Secretary of State you will add that her Majesty's government have adopted this course under the full persuasion that the government of the United States will, on their part, at once desist from exercising toward neutrals the rights of blockade, and of search and detention of neutral vessels on the high seas, which can be lawfully exercised by belligerents alone, and which a power not engaged in warfare cannot under the law of nations assume to exercise.

I am, &c.,

RUSSELL.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 10, 1865, p. 2.]

No. 3.

Earl Russell to Earl Cowley.

FOREIGN OFFICE, June 2, 1865.

MY LORD: With reference to the point raised by you in your conversation with M. Drouyn de Lhuys, reported in your dispatch of the 31st instant, I have to state to your excellency that I am advised by the law officers of the crown that it is a correct proposition of law that if, upon the complete cessation of hostilities, any ships which at the time of such cessation were the property of the confederate government, and have not been lawfully transferred to any other owner, are found within her Majesty's territories, such ships may be claimed as public property by the government of the United States. But every such claim, if made, and resisted by any counter-claimant, must be decided in the ordinary

course of law by the civil tribunals. Each such case may depend upon mixed questions of law and fact, and it is not necessary, nor would it be expedient, for her Majesty's government in any of their public acts to refer to the possible occurrence of questions of this nature.

I am, &c.,

RUSSELL.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Hunter.

[Extract.]

No. 975.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, June 2, 1865.

SIR: Within a couple of weeks there has been a singular attempt at a renewal of the panic in regard to the designs of our government, which made the subject of my dispatches some time ago.

A story has been sedulously circulated that the change in the presidency had been the signal for a renewal of the old demand for reparation for the damage done by the Alabama and other vessels fitted out in England, and that in a more imperious and absolute manner. This at last assumed a distinct shape in the journal called the Owl, already referred to in former dispatches as reputed to be conducted by persons who have more or less access to high sources of authority. The article was transferred without comment to the columns of the Times and other leading journals, and thus gained credence in spite of decided contradictions which appeared in the Globe and the News.

It should be observed that this publication called the Owl has developed this season, much more decidedly than it did last year, its sympathies with the cause of the rebels. Indeed, on more than one occasion it has betrayed most unmistakably its sources of authority in the statements made touching their affairs.

I have received intimations, but not founded on any authority I can rely on, that there are some secret affiliations in that journal with the power on the other side of the channel. Be this as it may, the fact is certain that the announcement to which I have referred was made the basis of a proposal for an alliance, offensive and defensive, between the two nations of France and Great Britain against the United States.

You may perhaps recollect that in a former dispatch (No. 879, of the 16th of February) I distinctly referred to such a project as among the schemes agitated by the rebel agents and their friends on this side of the water.

The matter excited so much attention, and stirred the very sensitive stock market so seriously, as to give rise to a movement in the House of Commons intended to quiet it. But, rather unfortunately, Lord Palmerston, in answering an inquiry proposed by Sir John Walsh, on the 26th ultimo, gave a response so ambiguously couched as rather to increase than to diminish the credit given to the rumor.

The same thing happened again on Tuesday evening, as will appear by the report of what was said, in the copy of the London Times of Wednesday, which I now transmit. Very fortunately, however, Mr. W. E. Forster, not satisfied with the state in which the matter was left by Lord Palmerston, persevered with another adroit inquiry, addressed to Mr. Layard, the under-secretary of the Foreign Office. And this produced a plain and straightforward answer, which covered all the points in the case.

I shall not undertake to decide as to the causes which led Lord Palmerston thus twice over to evade making a rectification of this story. * * * Unquestionably, the only foundation for the report is to be had in the fact of the presentation of my successive notes to Lord Russell of the 7th of April and the 20th of May, the first of which was presented some time before the death of the late President, and the second was called forth only by a necessity imposed by the excursive nature of his lordship's reply. Catching somehow or other at the knowledge of the existence of these notes, it has been thought worth while by somebody to make that fact the basis of an alarm which might tolerate the otherwise unwelcome suggestion of an alliance with France, as against the United States.

If I am right in my statement, it is not, perhaps, unfair to infer here the presence of three threads of influence combined in one cord of intrigue: The first, that of the indefatigable rebel emissaries; the second, that of French-Mexicanism under imperial shelter; the third, that of aristocratic British sympathy with the rebellion.

I shall probably have occasion for some time to come to notice and expose similar schemes. Whilst but little disposed to attach importance to them, or to believe in any chances of their success, I think it my duty to continue to transmit to you the information, in order that you may be placed on your guard and hold in your hands at all times the means of counteracting the false impressions attempted here by such devices.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM HUNTER,
Acting Secretary of State.

[For debate see Parliamentary and Judicial Appendix No. 24.]

[From British Blue Book "North America," No. 6, 1865, p. 2.]

No. 2.

Sir J. Crampton to Earl Russell.

MADRID, June 6, 1865.

MY LORD: With reference to my dispatch of yesterday's date, informing your lordship that I had communicated to the Spanish government the decision of her Majesty's government to consider the war in North America at an end, I have the honor to inclose an extract from the Madrid Gazette, with translation, containing a royal decree abrogating the royal decree of the 17th of June, 1861, by which the Confederate States of America were recognized as belligerents.

I have, &c.

JOHN F. CRAMPTON.

[Translation.]

Ministry of State.

ROYAL DECREE.

The war between the States of the North and those of the South in the republic of the United States having terminated, and the circum-

stances having, consequently on the establishment of peace, ceased to exist which suggested the measures contained in my royal decree of the 17th of June, 1861, referring to the neutrality of Spain in the afore-said war, I have decreed as follows:

Single article. My royal decree of the 17th of June, 1861, is abrogated.

Given at Aranjuez, June 4, 1865.

(Signed)

REGIA MANU.

Countersigned: ANTONIO BENAVIDES,
Minister of State.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Hunter.

No. 983.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, June 8, 1865.

SIR: I transmit herewith a copy of the London Gazette of the 6th, containing Lord Russell's note to the lords commissioners of the admiralty, of the 2d instant, announcing the withdrawal of the recognition of belligerency. This is in accordance with the report of it, which I gave in my No. 977, of 2d of June, detailing the substance of my conversation with his lordship on that day. This course appears to have been concurrently adopted by the French government.

Thus is at last removed the grave cause of remonstrance commenced on the day of my very first conference with his lordship, in May, 1861, and persevered in at brief intervals, through the intervening period of four years. Precipitate and extraordinary as was the original act, the same characteristic has not attended the withdrawal. Possibly, even at this late moment, absolute consistency might have demanded a little further delay on account of the declared blockade yet continued on the coast of Texas. But inasmuch as the dates give the strongest reasons for believing that the original step was determined upon even prior to the first declaration of blockade, which has since been assigned as the justifying cause, the inconsistency is not more marked at the end than it was at the outset.

Inasmuch as the discussion of the claims for reparation occasioned by the war has now been pretty much exhausted on both sides, it may be reasonably expected that the labors of this legation will henceforth be considerably lightened. Upon this result I congratulate the department, upon which, of course, the whole of the direction, involving a greater share of work, necessarily devolves. Hereafter it would seem as if, at least on this side, little beyond ordinary discretion will be required to continue the relations between the two countries on a tolerably satisfactory footing.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM HUNTER,
Acting Secretary of State.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 6, 1865. p. 1.]

*Earl Russell to the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty.**

FOREIGN OFFICE, June 2, 1865.

MY LORDS: I have the honor to state to your lordships that, since the date of my letter of the 11th ultimo, intelligence has reached this country that the late President of the so-called Confederate States has been captured by the military forces of the United States, and has been transported as a prisoner to Fort Monroe, and that the armies hitherto kept in the field by the Confederate States have for the most part surrendered or dispersed.

In this posture of affairs her Majesty's government are of opinion that neutral nations cannot but consider the civil war in North America as at an end.

In conformity with this opinion, her Majesty's government recognize that peace has been restored within the whole territory of which the United States of North America before the commencement of the civil war were in undisturbed possession.

As a necessary consequence of such recognition on the part of her Majesty's government, her Majesty's several authorities in all ports, harbors, and waters belonging to her Majesty, whether in the United Kingdom or beyond the seas, must henceforth refuse permission to any vessel of war carrying a confederate flag to enter any such ports, harbors, and waters; and must require any confederate vessels of war which, at the time when these orders reach her Majesty's authorities in such ports, harbors, and waters, may have already entered therein on the faith of proclamations heretofore issued by her Majesty, and which, having complied with the provisions of such proclamations, may be actually within such ports, harbors, and waters, forthwith to depart from them.

But her Majesty's government consider that a due regard for national good faith and honor requires that her Majesty's authorities should be instructed, as regards any such confederate vessel so departing, that they should have the benefit of the prohibition heretofore enforced against pursuit of them within twenty-four hours by a cruiser of the United States lying at the time within any such ports, harbors, and waters, and that such prohibition should be then and for the last time maintained in their favor.

If, however, the commander of any confederate vessel of war which may be found in any port, harbor, or waters of her Majesty's dominions at the time these new orders are received by her Majesty's authorities, or may enter such ports, harbors, or waters within a month after these new orders are received, should wish to divest his vessel of her warlike character, and, after disarming her, to remain without a confederate flag within British waters, her Majesty's authorities may allow the commander of such vessel to do so at his own risk in all respects, in which case he should be distinctly apprised that he is to expect no further protection from her Majesty's government, except such as he may be entitled to in the ordinary course of the administration of the law in time of peace.

The rule as to twenty-four hours would, of course, not be applicable to the case of such vessel.

I have addressed a similar letter to the secretary of state for the home, colonial, India, and war offices, and also to the lords commissioners of her Majesty's treasury, requesting them, as I do your lordships, to issue

* Similar letters were addressed to the Home Office, Colonial Office, War Office, Treasury, and India Office.

instructions in conformity with the decision of her Majesty's government to the several British authorities at home or abroad, who may be called upon to act in the matter.

I am, &c.,

RUSSELL.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 6, 1865, p. 3.]

No. 3.

Earl Cowley to Earl Russell.

PARIS, June 13, 1865.

MY LORD: I have the honor to inclose herewith, extracted from the *Moniteur* of this day, a circular addressed by the minister of marine to the maritime préfets, &c., stating that the imperial government will no longer recognize belligerents in North America, and that confederate ships cannot be allowed in French ports.

I have, &c.,

COWLEY.

[Inclosure.]

Extract from the Moniteur of June 13, 1865.

[Translation.]

The minister for marine and the colonies has addressed the following circular, dated the 5th of this month, to the maritime prefects, naval commanders, and governors of the colonies:

PARIS, June 5, 1865.

"GENTLEMEN: In proclaiming by their declaration of the 10th of June, 1861, the rules of neutrality which they intended to observe between the belligerents of the different States of North America, the Emperor's government recognized a pre-existing fact; that is to say, the conflict established between two portions of the territory of the United States, a conflict in which the laws of war were observed on one side as well as on the other, both as regards the treatment and exchange of prisoners, as well as the rights to be put in force as regards neutral flags.

"At present, after the events which have taken place, the situation of affairs is completely altered. The minister for the United States at the Emperor's court has announced that the cabinet of Washington considered the war as having ceased, and that it abandoned all pretension to the exercise of the right of search against neutrals, as it has been employed during the war.

"In this state of affairs the Emperor's government do not consider that they ought any longer to recognize the States of North America as belligerent.

"In consequence, vessels presenting themselves as confederate vessels can no longer be received in the ports of the continent nor of the colonies, nor in the territorial waters of the empire, and the confederate flag cannot be any longer displayed in our ports.

"As regards those vessels which may be in our ports when the pre-

ent dispatch reaches you, they must depart; but you will cause to be observed, for the last time in their behalf, the rule laid down in my circular of the 5th of February, 1864, and by the terms of which an interval of at least twenty-four hours must be observed between the departure of any vessel of war of one of the belligerents and the subsequent departure of any vessel of war of the other belligerent.

"Accept, &c.

"P. DE CHASSELOUP-LAUBAT,

"*The Minister Secretary of State for the Navy and Colonies.*"

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 7, 1865, p. 2.]

No. 2.

Earl Russell to Sir F. Bruce.

FOREIGN OFFICE, June 16, 1865.

SIR: The clause in the President's proclamation of the 22d of May which threatens certain offenders as pirates, and which you justly describe in your dispatch of the 26th ultimo as unintelligible, seems to have arisen from a confusion of two very separate offenses.

The one would be the offense of attempting to trade, to carry manufactures or provisions, for instance, into such ports as Charleston, Mobile, or Wilmington, ports in the possession of the United States. This would be an offense of violating laws and regulations of the nature of custom-house regulations, and punishable as such.

The other would be the offense of attempting by armed vessels, such as the Stonewall, to break into the ports of Galveston and Brownsville, then in the possession of the confederates, with a view of aiding them in their insurrection.

This would be an offense against the sovereignty of the United States, and, the state of war having ceased, would amount to the crime of high treason.

Neither offense could constitute piracy, which is a crime against all mankind.

But as, since the date of the proclamation, Galveston and the other ports excepted have been reduced within the obedience of the United States, it will probably not be necessary that you should point out this error in the proclamation of the 22d of May.

You will take care, however, to attend to any case in which a British subject may be wrongfully detained in prison, after the more recent proclamations of the President, of which I have not, however, received from you official copies.

I am, &c.

RUSSELL.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 9, p. 2.]

No. 2.

Sir F. Bruce to Earl Russell.

WASHINGTON, June 19, 1865.

MY LORD: In accordance with the instructions contained in your lordship's dispatch of the 2d instant, I left a copy of that dispatch with

Mr. Hunter, acting Secretary of State, and have now the honor to inclose a copy of Mr. Seward's reply just received.

I have, &c.

FREDERICK W. A. BRUCE.

[Inclosure.]

Mr. Seward to Sir F. Bruce.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 19, 1865.

SIR: Due consideration has been given to a dispatch which Earl Russell addressed to you on the 2d of June instant, and of which, on the 14th instant, you were so kind as to leave a copy at this department. The President is gratified by the information which that paper contains, to the effect that her Majesty's government have determined to consider the war which has lately prevailed between the United States and the insurgents of this country to have ceased *de facto*, and that her Majesty's government now recognize the re-establishment of peace within the whole territory of which the United States were in undisturbed possession at the beginning of the civil war.

The President is also gratified to learn from Earl Russell's dispatch that her Majesty's government will forthwith send to her Majesty's authorities in all ports, harbors, and waters belonging to her Majesty, whether within the United Kingdom or beyond the seas, orders henceforth to refuse admission into any such ports, harbors, and waters of any vessel of war carrying the insurgent flag, and to require any insurgent vessels of war, which, after the time that the orders may be received by her Majesty's authorities, may have already entered such ports, and which having complied with the previous proclamations of the British government, may be actually within such ports, harbors, and waters, forthwith to depart from the same.

It is with regret, however, that I have to inform you that Earl Russell's dispatch is accompanied by some reservations and explanations which are deemed unacceptable by the government of the United States. It is hardly necessary to say that the United States do not admit what they have heretofore constantly controverted, that the original concession of belligerent privileges to the rebels by Great Britain was either necessary or just, or sanctioned by the law of nations.

The correspondence which took place between this government and that of her Majesty at an early stage of the insurrection show that the United States deemed the formation of a mutual engagement by Great Britain with France, that those two powers would act in concert in regard to the said insurrection to be an unfriendly proceeding, and that the United States therefore declined to receive from either of those powers any communication which avowed the existence of such an arrangement. I have therefore now to regret that Earl Russell has thought it necessary to inform this government that her Majesty's government have found it expedient to consult with the government of France upon the question whether her Majesty's government will now recognize the restoration of peace in the United States.

It is a further source of regret that her Majesty's government avow that they will still continue to consider that any United States cruiser, which shall hereafter be lying in a British port, harbor, or waters, shall

be detained twenty-four hours, so as to afford an opportunity for an insurgent vessel, then actually being within the said port, harbor, or waters, to gain the advantage of the same time for her departure from the same port, harbor, or waters.

It is further source of regret that her Majesty's government have deemed it proper to make the additional reservation in favor of insurgent vessels of war, that for the period of a whole month which shall elapse after the new orders now to be issued by her Majesty's government shall have been received by the said authorities, any insurgent vessel which may be found in or which may enter any port, harbor, or waters of her Majesty's dominions, and which may desire to divest itself of its warlike character, and to assume the flag of any nation recognized by her Majesty's government with which her Majesty is at peace, will be allowed to do so; and further, that such vessels after disarming themselves will be permitted to remain in such port, harbor, or waters without an insurgent flag, although the twenty-four hours' rule will not be applicable to the cases of such vessels. Far from being able to admit the legality or justice of the instructions thus made, it is my duty to inform your excellency that, in the first place, the United States cannot assent to an abridgment of reciprocal hospitalities between the public vessels of the United States and those of Great Britain. So long as her Majesty's government shall insist upon enforcing the twenty-four hours' rule before mentioned, of which the United States have so long and, as they think, so justly complained, the United States must apply the same rule to public vessels of Great Britain.

Again it is my duty further to state, that the United States cannot admit, and on the contrary they controvert and protest against, the decision of the British government, which would allow vessels of war of insurgents or pirates to enter or to leave British ports, whether for disarmament or otherwise, or for assuming a foreign flag or otherwise. As to all insurgent or piratical vessels found in ports, harbors, or waters of British dominions, whether they entered into such ports, harbors, or waters before or after any new orders of her Majesty's government may be received by any authority of her Majesty's government established there, this government maintains and insists that such vessels are forfeited to and ought to be delivered to the United States upon reasonable application in such cases made, and that if captured at sea under whatsoever flag by a naval force of the United States, such capture will be lawful.

Notwithstanding, however, the exceptions and reservations which have been made by her Majesty's government, and which have been herein considered, the United States accept with pleasure the declaration by which her Majesty's government have withdrawn their former concession of a belligerent character to the insurgents, and this government further freely admits that the normal relations between the two countries being practically restored to the condition in which they stood before the civil war, the right to search British vessels has come to an end by an arrangement satisfactory in every material respect between the two nations.

It will be a source of satisfaction to this government to know that her Majesty's government have considered the views herein presented in a spirit favorable to the establishment of a lasting and intimate friendship between the two nations.

I have, &c.,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

Mr. Hunter to Mr. Adams.

No. 1464.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
June 26, 1865.

SIR: I transmit herewith for your information, and that of the government to which you are accredited, two copies of the President's proclamation of the 23d instant relative to the blockade.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

W. HUNTER,
Acting Secretary.

By the President of the United States of America.

A PROCLAMATION.

Whereas, by the proclamations of the President of the nineteenth and twenty-seventh of April, eighteen hundred and sixty-one, a blockade of certain ports of the United States was set on foot; but, whereas the reasons for that measure have ceased to exist:

Now, therefore, be it known that I, ANDREW JOHNSON, President of the United States, do hereby declare and proclaim the blockade aforesaid to be rescinded as to all the ports aforesaid, including that of Galveston and other ports west of the Mississippi River, which ports will be open to foreign commerce on the first of July next, on the terms and conditions set forth in my proclamation of the twenty-second of May last.

It is to be understood, however, that the blockade thus rescinded was an international measure for the purpose of protecting the sovereign rights of the United States. The greater or less subversion of civil authority in the region to which it applied, and the impracticability of at once restoring that in due efficiency, may, for a season, make it advisable to employ the army and navy of the United States towards carrying the laws into effect wherever such employment may be necessary.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand, and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington, this twenty-third day of June, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-five, [SEAL.] and of the independence of the United States of America the eighty-ninth.

ANDREW JOHNSON.

By the President:

W. HUNTER, *Acting Secretary of State.*

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 10, 1865, p. 3.]

No. 4.

Earl Russell to Sir F. Bruce.

FOREIGN OFFICE, July 1, 1865.

SIR: I have to inform you that her Majesty's government have had under their consideration, in communication with the proper law advisers of the Crown, a printed copy of the proceedings in the prize court in the case of the *Etta*, or *Retribution*, which has been forwarded to this office

by her Majesty's consul at New York, and I have to state to you that, although this is a case of first impression, her Majesty's government are of opinion that, upon the principles of maritime international law applicable to such a case, the vessel was lawfully and rightly condemned.

This opinion, of course, involves the assent of her Majesty's government to the very important position of law that the ship of an enemy which has been a commissioned ship of war cannot, during the continuance of the war, be relieved from the risk of capture and condemnation in the prize court of the other belligerent by any sale or transfer to a neutral, although such neutral may purchase her with the *bona fide* intention of using her for his own benefit in lawful commerce, and may, to the utmost of his power, divest her of her warlike character, and convert her into and use her as a merchant vessel.

I am, &c.,

RUSSELL.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 10, 1865, p. 3.]

No. 5.

Earl Russell to Sir F. Bruce.

FOREIGN OFFICE, July 6, 1865.

SIR: I have received and laid before the Queen your dispatch of the 19th of June, with a copy of Mr. Seward's note on the subject of the cessation of belligerent rights.

Her Majesty's government are sorry to find that the reservations and explanations which accompanied the orders of the 2d of June are deemed unacceptable by the government of the United States.

Her Majesty's government did not expect, indeed, that the United States, after the course they have hitherto taken, would now acknowledge that the original concession of belligerent rights was either necessary or just, or sanctioned by the law of nations.

Her Majesty's government, however, having, in common with all the maritime powers of Europe, acknowledged the belligerent rights of blockade on the part of the United States, and having recognized the existence of a belligerent against whom that right was exercised in conformity, as they are convinced, with the law of nations and the practice of centuries, could not be expected on their part to shrink from the consequences of the course they had deliberately adopted. Her Majesty's government, therefore, considered that a due regard for national faith and honor required that any confederate vessel of war called upon to depart from her Majesty's ports, harbors, or waters, should have the benefit of the twenty-four hours rule. But you will observe to Mr. Seward that this rule is then to be enforced for the last time.

Consequently, no confederate vessel of war, taking advantage of this rule, could ever again have the benefit of it.

Her Majesty's government have, in a like spirit, allowed that vessels lying in her Majesty's harbors or waters, or which, during the space of a month, shall come into these harbors or waters, shall be permitted to disarm and assume a peaceful character. Otherwise vessels at sea, ignorant of the termination of the war, might be driven without coals or sails to perish on the neighboring rocks, or to founder at sea. Such inhospitality would not become the character of the nation for good faith and honor, or for humanity.

But you will observe that her Majesty's government have instructed their authorities in distant ports distinctly to apprise the commander of any such confederate vessel that he is to expect no further protection from her Majesty's government, except such as he may be entitled to in the ordinary course of the administration of the law in time of peace. The twenty-four hours rule would not be applicable to such case.

The government of the United States will, therefore, be entitled to maintain that such vessels are forfeited, and ought to be delivered to the United States upon reasonable application in such cases made. Only such application must be made good in a British court of law if the vessel is found in British waters.

In the case of a vessel captured at sea by a naval force of the United States, under whatever flag, the claim ought to be made good in a court of law of the United States.

Her Majesty's government will further illustrate their views on this head by the inclosures to this dispatch.*

Part of these inclosures consist of dispatches to and from Paris. Her Majesty's government never can admit that, in presence of a great war which interrupted and destroyed a friendly and useful commerce extending along three thousand miles of the American coast—a war reducing great numbers of industrious families of both nations to poverty, and afflicting a whole continent—the governments of England and France should not, as far as possible, act in concert, in pursuance not of any formal engagement, but of a mutual understanding.

Her Majesty's government, however, are gratified to find that the United States no longer claim the belligerent right to search British vessels, and that the normal relations of the two countries are practically returned to the condition in which they stood before the civil war.

Her Majesty's government trust that these explanations, founded upon views which her Majesty's government have maintained in a spirit of just neutrality, will prove to be favorable to the establishment of a lasting and intimate friendship between the two nations.

I am, &c.,

RUSSELL.

PORT REGULATIONS.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," 1862, No. 1, p. 35.]

No. 42.

Lord Lyons to Lord J. Russell.

WASHINGTON, May 11, 1861.

MY LORD: I have the honor to inform your lordship that telegraphic intelligence has reached this place that the southern congress has declared war against the United States, and authorized the issue of letters of marque. I have not, however, learned that any letters of marque have yet been actually issued.

I do myself the honor to inclose a copy of a dispatch on the subject, which I have addressed to Rear-Admiral Sir Alexander Milne.

I have, &c.,

LYONS.

* See Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4, from British Blue Book, "North America," No. 10, 1865, ante.

[Inclosure.]

Lord Lyons to Rear-Admiral Sir A. Milne.

WASHINGTON, May 10, 1861.

SIR: With reference to my dispatch of the 27th ultimo, I have the honor to inform you that telegraphic intelligence has reached this place that the congress sitting at Montgomery, in Alabama, has declared war against the United States, and has authorized the *de facto* executive government of the so-called Confederate States to issue letters of marque. I have not, however, learned that any letters of marque have as yet been actually issued.

Considerable alarm has, you are aware, been expressed to me by some of her Majesty's consuls, as well as by merchants and others, lest these privateers should be in fact little better than pirates, and should not confine their depredations to United States vessels. You are much better able than I am to judge how far it is desirable to take measures at once to protect British merchant vessels from danger. I do not think it advisable, during the short interval which will now elapse before instructions may be received from her Majesty's government, to interfere with these privateers solely on the ground that their letters of marque will proceed from a government not recognized by her Majesty. But I presume that it would be perfectly justifiable to take any measures whatever concerning them which were clearly necessary for the security of British trade. The United States government has, as you know, declared its intention to treat them as pirates. Almost all the ships of which that government can dispose will be sent to the coasts of the southern States for the purpose of blockading the ports and capturing the privateers.

I have, &c.,

LYONS.

Copy of the order of the secretary of the colonies addressed to the governor general of Canada.

[Taken from Boston Transcript of June 20, 1861, copying Montreal daily papers of June 18, 1861.]

DOWNING STREET, June 1, 1861.

SIR: You are already aware that the Queen is desirous of observing the strictest neutrality in the contest which appears to be imminent between the United States and the so-called Confederate States of North America. I have now to inform you that, in order to give full effect to this principle, her Majesty has been pleased to interdict the armed ships and also the privateers of both parties from carrying prizes made by them into the ports, harbors, roadsteads, or waters of the United Kingdom, or of any of her Majesty's colonies or possessions abroad.

It is her Majesty's desire that the prohibition should be forthwith notified to all proper authorities within her dominion, and I am to desire that you take measures to secure its effectual observance within the limits of your government.

I have, &c.,

NEWCASTLE.

Right Hon. Sir EDW. HEAD.

[See also circular instructions of June 2, 1864, with Mr. Adams's dispatch of June 17, 1864, to Mr. Seward *ante*.]

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 1, 1862, p. 38.]

No. 46.

Lord J. Russell to Lord Lyons.

FOREIGN OFFICE, June 1, 1861.

MY LORD: I transmit herewith, for your lordship's information, a copy of a letter which I have addressed, by her Majesty's commands, to the admiralty, colonial, war, and India offices, desiring that the necessary instructions may be given for interdicting the armed ships and privateers, both of the United States and of the so-called Confederate States, from carrying prizes made by them into the ports, harbors, roadsteads, or waters of the United Kingdom, or of any of her Majesty's colonies or possessions abroad.

I am, &c.,

J. RUSSELL.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 1, 1862, p. 38.]

No. 45.

*Lord J. Russell to the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty.**

FOREIGN OFFICE, June 1, 1861.

MY LORDS: Her Majesty's government are, as you are aware, desirous of observing the strictest neutrality in the contest which appears to be imminent between the United States and the so-styled Confederate States of North America; and with the view more effectually to carry out this principle, they propose to interdict the armed ships and also the privateers of both parties from carrying prizes made by them into the ports, harbors, roadsteads, or waters of the United Kingdom, or of any of her Majesty's colonies or possessions abroad.

I have accordingly to acquaint your lordships that the Queen has been pleased to direct that orders in conformity with the principles above stated should forthwith be addressed to all proper authorities in the United Kingdom, and to her Majesty's naval and other authorities in all quarters beyond the United Kingdom, for their guidance in the circumstances.

I am, &c.,

J. RUSSELL.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 1, 1862, pp. 63-68.]

No. 74.

Messrs. Yancey, Rost, and Mann to Earl Russell.

[Extracts.]

15, HALF-MOON STREET,
London, August 14, 1861.

The undersigned, as your lordship has already on two occasions been verbally and unofficially informed, were appointed on the 16th of March

* Similar letters were addressed to the colonial, war, and India offices.

last a commission to her Britannic Majesty's government by the President of the Confederate States of America.

The undersigned were instructed to represent to your lordship that seven of the sovereign States of the late American Union, for just and sufficient reasons, and in full accordance with the great principle of self-government, had thrown off the authority of that Union and formed a confederacy which they had styled the "Confederate States of America." They are further instructed to ask her Majesty's government to recognize the fact of the existence of this new power in the world, and also to inform it that they were fully empowered to negotiate with it a treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation.

At an early day after the arrival of the undersigned in London, at an informal interview which your lordship was pleased to accord them, they informed your lordship of the object of their mission.

The undersigned have witnessed with pleasure that the views which, in their first interview, they pressed upon your lordship as to the undoubted right of the Confederate States, under the law of nations, to be treated as a belligerent power, and the monstrous assertion of the government of Washington of its right to treat their citizens found in arms upon land or sea as rebels and pirates, have met with the concurrence of her Britannic Majesty's government; and that the moral might of this great and Christian people has been thus thrown into the scale to prevent the barbarous and inhuman spectacle of war between citizens so lately claiming a common country, conducted upon principles which would have been a disgrace to the age in which we live.

The undersigned, however, received with some surprise and regret the avowal of her Britannic Majesty's government that, in order to the observance of a strict neutrality, the public and private armed vessels of neither of the contending parties would be permitted to enter her Majesty's ports with prizes. The undersigned do not contest the right of the British government to make such regulations, but have been disposed to think that it has been unusual for her Majesty's government to exercise such right, and that in this instance the practical operation of the rule has been to favor the government at Washington, and to cripple the exercise of an undoubted public right of the government of the Confederate States. This government commenced its career entirely without a navy. Owing to the high sense of duty which distinguished the southern officers who were lately in commission in the United States navy, the ships which otherwise might have been brought into southern ports were honorably delivered up to the United States government, and the navy, built for the protection of the people of all the States, is now used by the government at Washington to coerce the people and blockade the ports of one-third of the States of the late Union.

The people of the Confederate States are an agricultural, not a manufacturing or commercial people. They own but few ships. Hence there has been not the least necessity for the government at Washington to issue letters of marque. The people of the Confederate States have but few ships, and not much commerce upon which such private armed vessels could operate. The commodities produced in the Confederate States are such as the world needs more than any other, and the nations of the earth have heretofore sent their ships to our wharves, and there the merchants buy and receive our cotton and tobacco.

But it is far otherwise with the people of the present United States. They are a manufacturing and commercial people. They do a large part of the carrying trade of the world. Their ships and commerce

afford them the sinews of war, and keep their industry afloat. To cripple this industry and commerce, to destroy their ships or cause them to be dismantled and tied up to their rotting wharves, are legitimate objects and means of warfare.

Having no navy, no commercial marine out of which to improvise public armed vessels to any considerable extent, the Confederate States were compelled to resort to the issuance of letters of marque, a mode of warfare as fully and clearly recognized by the law and usage of nations as any other arm of war, and most assuredly more humane and more civilized in its practice than that which appears to have distinguished the march of the troops of the government of the United States upon the soil and among the villages of Virginia.

These facts tend to show that the practical working of the rule that forbids the entry of the public and private armed vessels of either party into British ports with prizes, operates exclusively to prevent the exercise of this legitimate mode of warfare by the Confederate States, while it is, to a great degree, a practical protection to the commerce and ships of the United States.

In the interview already alluded to, as well as in one of a similar character, held between your lordship and the undersigned at a later date, the undersigned were fully aware of the relations of amity existing between her Britannic Majesty's government and that of Washington, and of the peculiar difficulties into which these relations might be thrown if her Majesty should choose to recognize the nationality of the Confederate States of America before some decided exhibition of ability upon the part of the government of those States to maintain itself had been shown.

In closing this communication the undersigned desire to urge upon her Britannic Majesty's government the just claim which, in their opinion, the government of the Confederate States has at this time to a recognition as a government *de facto*.

The undersigned, &c.

W. L. YANCEY.
P. A. ROST.
A. DUDLEY MANN.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 84.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, September 10, 1861.

SIR: I send you an extract of a letter just received from Mr. Francis Bernard, in the island of Trinidad. It shows a clear case of connivance by the authorities of that island with the insurgents of the United States, in violation of the rights and dignity of this government, if the facts are truly presented. You will bring the subject to the notice of Lord Russell, and will, if the case shall not be satisfactorily explained, ask for such proceedings in the premises as shall make the authorities of the island sensible of the displeasure of the imperial government, and prevent such occurrences in the future.

For your satisfaction, I state that a new consul has been appointed at Trinidad, and that he is now on his way to that island.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

22 A C—VOL. I

Mr. Bernard to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

TRINIDAD, August 7, 1861.

SIR: I beg to inform you that on the 30th ultimo a steam sloop of war (Semmes commander) carrying a secession flag, five guns, some of a large caliber, and a crew of from one hundred and twenty to one hundred and fifty men, sailed boldly in our harbor and reported herself to the authorities of this island as being on a cruise. She was last from Puerto Oabello; and since she succeeded in getting out of the Mississippi River she has already captured no less than eleven American vessels. I have ascertained the names of some of them, viz: the Joseph Maxwell, Abe Bradford, Minnie Miller, West Wind, of Westerly, with a cargo of sugar from Havana, and Golden Rocket, which was burnt by her off the coast of Cuba.

The Sumter landed eight of her prisoners here in a destitute condition; but a contribution has been raised here for their benefit, sufficient to supply their immediate wants, and I will take care that they are provided for till an opportunity offers to ship them to the States.

The Sumter remained here till the 5th instant, and was allowed to supply herself with coals and other necessary outfits. The British flag was hoisted on the government flag-staff for her arrival, and the officers of the British war vessel Cadmus appeared to be on amicable terms with those of the Sumter. The merchant who supplied the Sumter with coals did it with the consent and approval of our attorney general.

Being a loyal American, I consider it my duty to send you these informations, as there has been no consul of our nation in this island for many months.

I am, sir, your most obedient servant,

FRANÇOIS BERNARD.

The SECRETARY OF STATE of the United States.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 53.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,

London, October 4, 1861.

SIR: I have to acknowledge the reception of dispatches from the department, numbered from 85 to 89, both inclusive.

The dispatch No. 85, dated the 10th of September, like its immediate predecessor, No. 84, of the same date, though received here a week earlier, relates to cases of violation of neutrality in the British islands in the West Indies. I have now the honor to forward copies of two notes addressed by me to Lord Russell, one of the 30th of September and the other of the following day, touching these questions.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD;

Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, September 30, 1861.

The undersigned, envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States, regrets to be obliged to inform the right honorable Earl Russell, her Majesty's principal secretary of state for foreign affairs, that he has been instructed by the President of the United States to prefer a complaint against the authorities of the island of Trinidad for a violation of her Majesty's proclamation of neutrality, by giving aid and encouragement to the insurgents of the United States. It appears, by an extract from a letter received at the Department of State from a gentleman believed to be worthy of credit, a resident of Trinidad, Mr. Francis Bernard, a copy of which is submitted herewith, that a steam vessel, known as an armed insurgent privateer, called the *Sumter*, was received on the 30th of July last at that port, and was permitted to remain for six days, during which time she was not only furnished with all necessary supplies for the continuance of her cruise, under the sanction of the attorney general, but that her Majesty's flag was actually hoisted on the government flag-staff in acknowledgment of her arrival.

The undersigned has been directed by his government to bring this extraordinary proceeding to the attention of Lord Russell, and, in case it shall not be satisfactorily explained, to ask for the adoption of such measures as shall insure, on the part of the authorities of the island, the prevention of all occurrences of the kind during the continuance of the difficulties in America.

The undersigned deems it proper to add, in explanation of the absence of any official representation from Trinidad to substantiate the present complaint, that there was no consul of the United States there at the time of the arrival of the vessel. The undersigned had the honor, a few days since, to apprise Lord Russell of the fact that this deficiency had been since supplied, by preferring an application for her Majesty's exequator for a new consul, who is already on his way to occupy his post.

The undersigned begs to renew to Earl Russell the assurances of his highest consideration.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

[For inclosure see letter of Mr. Bernard, printed with "Mr. Seward's dispatch to Mr. Adams," of September 10, 1861, No. 84, *ante*.]

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 58.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, October 11, 1861.

SIR: I have the honor to inclose a copy of Lord Russell's note to me of the 4th instant, in reply to my representation of the conduct of the authorities of the island of Trinidad, made under instructions from the department.

It will appear from this that the governor of Trinidad, by hoisting the British flag on the government flag-staff, probably desired to signify to

the officers of the Sumter, on their arrival, the neutral character of the island, but that he in the meantime forgot that the act is susceptible of a very different construction in the popular mind.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, October 4, 1861.

The undersigned, her Majesty's principal secretary of state for foreign affairs, has had the honor to receive a complaint from Mr. Adams, envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States at this court, against the authorities of the island of Trinidad for a violation of her Majesty's proclamation of neutrality, by giving aid and encouragement to the insurgents of the United States.

It appears, from the accounts received at the colonial office and at the admiralty, that a vessel bearing the secession flag entered the port of Trinidad on the 30th of July last.

Captain Hillyar, of her Majesty's ship "Oadmus," having sent a boat to ascertain her nationality, the commanding officer showed a commission signed by Mr. Jefferson Davis, calling himself the President of the so-styled Confederate States.

The Sumter, which was the vessel in question, was allowed to stay six days at Trinidad, and to supply herself with coals and provisions, and the attorney general of the island perceived no illegality in these proceedings.

The law officers of the crown have reported that the conduct of the governor was in conformity to her Majesty's proclamation.

No mention is made by the governor of his hoisting the British flag on the government flag-staff; and if he did so, it was probably in order to show the national character of the island, and not in acknowledgment of the arrival of the Sumter.

There does not appear, therefore, any reason to believe that her Majesty's proclamation of neutrality has been violated by the governor of Trinidad, or by the commanding officer of her Majesty's ship "Oadmus."

The undersigned requests Mr. Adams to accept the assurance of his highest consideration.

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 112.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, October 29, 1861.

SIR: Your dispatch of October 11 (No. 58) has been received. It is accompanied by Lord Russell's reply to the note which you addressed to him by my direction, asking an explanation of the conduct of the colonial authorities in Trinidad on the occasion of the entrance of the piratical vessel, the Sumter, into that port.

Lord Russell admits that the *Sumter*, (an armed American vessel,) bearing an insurgent flag, entered the port of Trinidad, and when boarded and required to show her nationality, her commanding officer showed no legal authority from this government, but a pretended commission from a citizen of the United States, notoriously engaged in arms against them. Notwithstanding these facts, it is not denied that the governor of the island hoisted the British flag on the government flag-staff, although it is stated by Lord Russell that, if he did so, it was probably done in order to show the national character of the island, and not in acknowledgment of the arrival of the *Sumter*.

His lordship, however, admits that the *Sumter* was allowed to remain six days in Trinidad, and that during her stay she was allowed to supply herself with coals and provisions. The armament, the insurgent flag, and the spurious commission told the governor, as they sufficiently prove to her Majesty's government, that the *Sumter* is and can be nothing else than a piratical vessel. Her depredations on the commerce of this country form a part of the history of our times. The British government has, moreover, been directly informed by us that the *Sumter* is a piratical craft, and that the navigators and seamen on board of her are pirates, punishable by the laws of their own country with death. Lord Russell informs us that the law officers of the Crown have nevertheless reported that the conduct of the colonial authorities of Trinidad is in conformity to her Majesty's proclamation. Her Majesty's government dismiss our complaint from their consideration.

In view of these facts, it becomes my duty to instruct you to inform the British government that the President deeply regrets that Lord Russell is altogether unable to give to our complaint a satisfactory solution.

When it is considered how important a part commerce plays among the interests of our country, it will be seen that the United States cannot consent that pirates engaged in destroying it shall receive shelter and supplies in the ports of friendly nations. It tends to the universal derangement of commerce when piracy is anywhere tolerated, and therefore its suppression is a common interest of all civilized countries. But if any one power fails to preserve this interest, and to act for the common welfare, then it is easy to see that each state must provide for its own security at whatever cost, and however it may disturb the general harmony of the commercial world.

This government will consider how its safety may be best secured; but it cannot forbear from expressing a hope that her Majesty's ministers, in view of the gravity of the question, may deem the subject worthy of a deliberate reconsideration.

I am, sir, your most obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 1, 1862, p. 101.]

No. 109.

Lord Lyons to Earl Russell.

WASHINGTON, November 4, 1861.

MY LORD: Mr. Seward spoke to me, the day before yesterday, respecting the admission of the confederate vessel *Sumter* into British and Dutch ports.

With regard to the Dutch government, Mr. Seward said that he had been obliged to cause very serious remonstrances to be addressed to them, but that he had now been informed that they had given orders that the southern privateers should not be allowed to remain more than twenty-four hours in a Dutch port. It was true, he said, that it had been declared that these orders had not been issued in deference to the representations of the United States government; but this was immaterial; so long as the privateers were excluded in practice, he did not care to inquire on what ground that was done.

Mr. Seward then mentioned the reception of the *Sumter* at Trinidad, and alluded to your lordship's note to Mr. Adams of the 4th of October on the subject. He said he had been obliged to send immediately instructions to Mr. Adams with regard to that note. He did not tell me the nature of those instructions, but he spoke to me of the affair in a tone of complaint, and dwelt especially on the length of time during which the *Sumter* had been allowed to remain at Trinidad, and on the supplies which she had obtained there. He said that France, and, he thought, all the other powers of Europe, refused to allow privateers to remain for more than twenty-four hours in their ports. He could hardly conceive that England wished to stand alone as the only power which admitted the enemies of the United States, without restriction, into its harbors. He supposed that the matter could hardly have been presented in this light to her Majesty's government.

I observed to Mr. Seward that I supposed that in this matter each power had looked back to precedents, and taken the course which had been usual with it on similar occasions in former times. In one point the English rule was, I said, more stringent than that of France and many other powers, for armed vessels were not allowed to carry their prizes into British ports for any time, however short.

Mr. Seward did not pursue the conversation. He merely said that he had wished to mention the matter to me in the hope that I might do something towards getting it satisfactorily settled.

I have, &c.,

LYONS.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 1, 1862, p. 104.]

No. 114.

Lord Lyons to Earl Russell.

WASHINGTON, November 9, 1861.

MY LORD: With reference to my dispatch of the 4th instant, I have the honor to inform your lordship that this morning Mr. Seward spoke to me again on the subject of the admission of confederate vessels into British ports. He used very nearly the same language on this as on the former occasion. He seemed, however, to wish now to be understood as requesting me positively to suggest to her Majesty's government to adopt the rule in this respect which had, he said, been adopted by all the other powers of Europe. He seemed to desire to make this suggestion through me, rather than in a more formal manner through the United States minister in London.

I said to Mr. Seward that Great Britain had, I thought, been the first power to place any restriction upon the admission into her ports of the armed vessels of the belligerents in the present war; and that she had

no doubt followed the precedents afforded by her own previous conduct in similar cases. I did not make any difficulty about conveying Mr. Seward's suggestion to your lordship, but I did not express any opinion as to the reception it would meet with.

I have, &c.,

LYONS.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 122.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, November 11, 1861.

SIR: The case in regard to pirates engaged by the insurgents in this country practically stands thus: every naval power, and every commercial power except one, practically excludes them from their ports, except in distress, or for a visit of any kind longer than twenty-four hours, and from supplies, except of coals, for twenty-four hours' consumption.

Great Britain, as we are given to understand by the answer of Earl Russell, allows these pirates to visit her ports and stay at their own pleasure, receiving supplies without restriction.

We find it difficult to believe that the government of Great Britain has constituted this exception with full deliberation. I intimated in a preceding dispatch, No. 112, a hope that the subject might be reconsidered before it should be necessary for us to consider what remedies we can adopt to prevent the evils which must result to our commerce from the policy thus indicated by Great Britain. I have consulted on the subject with Lord Lyons, and he may perhaps communicate with his government thereupon. Meantime, I am directed by the President to instruct you to recall the attention of her Majesty's government to the question, under the influences of a spirit of peace and friendship, and with a desire to preserve what remains of a commerce mutually important to both countries.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 1, 1862, p. 103.]

No. 112.

Earl Russell to Lord Lyons.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *November 22, 1861.*

MY LORD: I have received your dispatch of the 4th instant, reporting the substance of a conversation you had had with Mr. Seward relative to the reception of the privateers and vessels of the so-styled Confederate States in foreign ports, and I have to state to you that it appears from that dispatch that Mr. Seward never chooses to understand the position of her Majesty's government. Her Majesty has declared entire neutrality in the unhappy contest now carried on in the United States. Her Majesty admits the ships of war and privateers of the United States to British ports, there to remain to victual and take in coal. If her Majesty were to refuse similar facilities to the vessels of war and privateers of the

so-styled Confederate States, her Majesty would be at once declaring herself a party to the war.

If Mr. Seward is desirous that the ships of war of the Confederate States should not be allowed to stay more than twenty-four in a British port, he should declare it in plain terms. In any case her Majesty's government are determined to treat the ships of war and privateers of the so-styled Confederate States in the same manner as the ships of war and privateers of the United States.

I am, &c.,

RUSSELL.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 93.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, December 20, 1861.

SIR: * * * * * I decided to ask a conference of Lord Russell for the purpose of talking over the substance of your communications to me in dispatches No. 136 and No. 137. It was appointed for yesterday at three o'clock, when I enjoyed an opportunity for full and frank conversation.

* * * * *

On the third point his lordship contested the fact as stated in the dispatch. He recapitulated what the government had done as regards the assistance said to have been rendered to privateers in the colonies. Supplies had been refused by the authorities in all cases. Whatever had been obtained had come from purchases of individuals. The only difference that he could find between the action of this government and that of other nations was, that the stay of belligerent vessels was confined by the latter to twenty-four hours. As to that, he said that the omission to insert the same provision in the British orders was by no means owing to unfriendliness to the United States. On the contrary, it was thought that if a government vessel of theirs should put into any port, such as Malta, for example, to stay a short time, it had seemed to them churlish to issue a decree to limit it to a single day. He said he had taken some pains to make inquiries as to the action of other governments, and, so far as he could learn, he found it in other respects substantially the same.

* * * * *

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 196.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 27, 1862.

SIR: I have just received from Mr. Morse, our consul at London, the information, carrying some appearance of probability, that the agents of the insurrection at London and Liverpool are engaged in preparing a

whole fleet of piratical privateers to depredate on our commerce in European waters. The Secretary of the Navy will, doubtlessly, immediately consider what can be done to protect this commerce.

But I confess to an apprehension that something is necessary to be done by the British government, and it seems to me it cannot rightfully be refused under present circumstances.

The British government, near a year ago, decided to concede to the insurgents the privileges of a belligerent power. The effect has been to invite the pirates across the Atlantic, and to seek the necessary shelter in British ports. Such have been the cases of the *Nashville* and the *Sumter*. Under that system, if the statements submitted by Mr. Morse are true, a piratical fleet is now actually being prepared in the ports of the British islands.

Indications of proceedings on the part of the pirates rendered it necessary that we should appear with armed vessels in the same waters to protect our commerce. The British government, apparently annoyed by the transfer of our conflict to her own vicinity, has now made an order, in which, placing our national vessels on the same footing with the pirates, she denies to either entrance into her ports, except in distress, and then a stay limited to twenty-four hours, with privilege of supplies of coal sufficient to reach the American coast. As coal cannot be carried across the ocean sufficient for supplies which a steamer requires in European waters, our vessels are thus effectually prevented from meeting the piratical fleet which it is reported is to be sent out from the British ports. Moreover, the British public have not without reason objected to the maintenance of police agents in Great Britain to watch and detect their operations. To attempt to maintain such agents there, after these complaints have reached us, would seem to involve a breach of courtesy. Does not it then devolve upon Great Britain herself to enforce in her own ports the ordinance of neutrality that she has proclaimed? Can piratical vessels be permitted to be launched from her own inland ports, upon their destructive missions, without giving us just reason to suppose that the neutrality actually practiced is, though not designed to be, fraudulent neutrality, more injurious to us than open hostility would be?

If the answer heretofore given you shall still be repeated, that the existing municipal laws permit no adequate measures of prevention, can Great Britain justly exclude us in this case from such privileges in her ports and waters as would be necessary for our own defense against the armed pirates issuing from them?

It is not in my power—it would even be disrespectful to the British government, were I to attempt to indicate what measures are proper or even possible for that government to adopt. It would seem enough for us to bear that British subjects and British vessels carry on from British ports a trade in violation equally of the British proclamation of neutrality and our proclamation of blockade, and yet it seems to be expected that we shall answer at once for the inefficiency of the blockade, and excessive vigor in maintaining it. This new feature of pirates fitting out under these changed circumstances in British ports, and sallying thence to destroy our unarmed vessels, without allowing us either the facilities for preventing it ourselves or the intervention of the British government, if allowed to be imprinted upon the face of this great transaction, would tend to alienate all sympathies whatever existing between ourselves and the British government and people.

For our own part, we must remain in the belief that the cause, and the only cause, of all the misapprehensions and embarrassments which

have occurred affecting the two countries was an unnecessary and premature concession of belligerent rights to the insurgents. Nor do I know how just such mischiefs as are now apprehended can be prevented in any way other than by revoking that concession. The time is favorable to that revocation. Let Great Britain resume the relations she held to us when this attempt at revolution occurred: the revolution, already rapidly declining, would in that case become extinct at once. Much might yet be restored, and speedily restored, too, of that commerce so useful to both parties which the insurrection has suspended. Much might yet be regained of that friendship and fraternal feeling which only so recently were regarded by both parties as auspices of their permanent security in all their various relations, and of the advancement of that civilization throughout the world to whose progress both of them are pledged.

But I return to the immediate subject.

Not one of the privateers alleged to be fitting out in British waters can find a home or even transient shelter in American waters. They would not be fitting out in Great Britain if they could get to sea when prepared by the insurgents here. If allowed to be fitted out there under such circumstances, will Great Britain claim that the proceeding is sanctioned by the law of nations?

Mr. Morse will, on your demand, report his information to you. You will scan it carefully, and if you find reason to believe that it is authentic, and that the danger he apprehends exists, you will bring the subject to the notice of Earl Russell, and ask his serious consideration upon it.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extracts.]

No. 137.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, March 27, 1862.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit the copies of three notes received by me from Lord Russell.

* * * * *

The second is in answer to my note of the 24th of February, respecting the treatment of the Flambeau at Nassau. The report is quite in keeping with all that we hear is done in that nest of illicit trade with the rebels. I have not deemed it advisable to pursue the subject.

* * * * *

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

HON. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *March 25, 1862.*

SIR: I had the honor, on the 1st instant, to state to you that I had applied to the proper department of her Majesty's government for infor-

mation as to the circumstances under which the authorities at Nassau had interdicted to the United States steamer *Flambeau* the use of a deposit of coal, the property of the United States government, existing at that place.

In now communicating to you the result of the inquiries which have been instituted, I assume that the case which you had in view, when you formed your representation, was that of some coal which arrived at Nassau in December last in the United States schooners *Caleb Stetson* and *W. S. Perry*.

It might, perhaps, be questioned whether the coal on board those vessels could in strictness be described as a deposit of coal existing at Nassau, but there seems no reason to doubt that it is to that coal that your letter refers. The facts in relation thereto are as follows:

In the early part of December the *Caleb Stetson* arrived at Nassau with a cargo of three hundred tons of coal, consigned to the United States consul at that port, and by the report and manifest, delivered at the revenue department, and signed officially by the United States consul as consignee, it appeared that such cargo had been shipped at Philadelphia for that port by "order of the United States Navy Department." The receiver general, having doubts as to the propriety of admitting this coal to entry, applied to the governor for instructions, and the governor, acting under legal advice, gave direction that the coal should be admitted to an entry and landing, but that the United States consul should be informed that it could not be permitted to be used in any manner which might involve a breach of the Queen's proclamation of the 13th of May last, and particularly that the coaling at Nassau of vessels of war of either of the belligerent powers could not be allowed without the express sanction of her Majesty's government having been first obtained. A letter to that effect was addressed by the colonial secretary to the United States consul.

While this question was pending, another vessel, the *W. S. Perry*, laden with coal similarly consigned, had arrived at Nassau, and the United States consul, on receiving the above intimation, declined to have the coal landed, and expressed his determination to keep the same on board of the respective vessels in which it had been imported, until he should receive advices from his government in relation thereto.

On the 11th of December the United States vessel *Flambeau* arrived at Nassau, and on the following day the United States consul addressed to the governor a letter, in which he stated that the *Caleb Stetson* was leaking badly, and requested permission to *land* the coal then on board of her, or to discharge a part of it on board of the *Flambeau*; in answer to which he was informed that, under the decision already arrived at, the coal could not be allowed to be transhipped to the *Flambeau*, but that there was no objection to its being landed. This privilege, although expressly asked for by the United States consul in his letter, he did not avail himself of.

On the 13th of December the United States consul addressed to the acting colonial secretary a letter complaining of coal having been supplied by a merchant to the secessionist vessel *Theodora*, and asking whether such an act did not constitute a breach of the neutrality adduced in the case of the *Flambeau*, which vessel, he adds, I "begged permission to furnish with coal yesterday."

To this letter the governor caused an answer to be sent, in which the distinction between the two cases was pointed out, and the decision not to supply coal to an armed vessel was adhered to. It was observed that the *Theodora* was a merchant vessel trading to the port of Nassau, and

that being propelled by steam it was necessary, to enable her to pursue her occupation as a trader, that she should be supplied with coal. The furnishing this necessary article, therefore, for her use by a merchant in the way of trade, was perfectly lawful, and could not be construed into a breach of neutrality.

On the other hand, the *Flambeau* was avowedly an armed vessel in the service of the federal government. She had entered the port of Nassau and had remained there for some days without any apparent necessity for her doing so, and the authorities had not been informed of the object of her visit. To supply her with coal might, therefore, be to facilitate her belligerent operations, and this would constitute an infraction of the neutrality prescribed by the Queen's proclamation of the 13th of May last.

It was also pointed out that the cases of the *James Adger* and the *Nashville*, at Southampton, were not parallel cases. Those vessels were some thousands of miles distant from their respective homes, and to them consequently coal was an article of real necessity; whereas the *Flambeau* was within a very short distance of the ports of her own nation—Key West, for instance, where also her necessities could readily be supplied.

Moreover, it was incorrect to say that the application of the United States consul had been founded on the necessities of the *Flambeau*; his application was founded on the alleged necessities of the *Caleb Stetson*.

I trust it will be apparent to you, from the foregoing statement, that the only object which the authorities at Nassau had in view was to preserve a strict neutrality. The obligation to do so was imposed by the Queen's proclamation above referred to, and the contiguity of the port of Nassau to the American coast was an additional reason for adhering strictly to its provisions.

In these circumstances her Majesty's government could not withhold from the governor the approval to which he was entitled for the course which he had pursued. The ultimate decision of her Majesty's government on this question is contained in the rules and regulations laid down in my letter* to the lord commissioners of the admiralty of the 31st of January last. I take it for granted that that letter has already been brought to your notice, but you will find it at the end of the printed papers lately laid before Parliament, and in the *London Gazette* of the 31st of January last.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[From the British Blue Book, "North America," No. 1, of 1862, p. 139.]

No. 156.

Earl Russell to Lord Lyons.

FOREIGN OFFICE, February 1, 1862.

MY LORD: I inclose for your information, and for communication to her Majesty's consuls in the northern and southern States, copies of the

* For this letter see inclosure to the next communication.

"Gazette" of last evening, containing a copy of a letter which I have addressed to the lords commissioners of the admiralty, to the several secretaries of state, and to the lords commissioners of her Majesty's treasury, signifying the Queen's pleasure with regard to the rules which her Majesty, with the view of preserving a strict neutrality, has commanded to be observed in all ports, harbors, roadsteads, and waters within her Majesty's territorial jurisdiction, during the continuance of the existing hostilities between the United States and the States calling themselves the Confederate States of North America.

I am, &c.,

RUSSELL.

[Inclosure.]

Earl Russell to the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty.

FOREIGN OFFICE, January 31, 1862.

MY LORDS: Her Majesty being fully determined to observe the duties of neutrality during the existing hostilities between the United States and the States calling themselves the Confederate States of America, and being, moreover, resolved to prevent, as far as possible, the use of her Majesty's harbors, ports, and coasts, and the waters within her Majesty's territorial jurisdiction, in aid of the warlike purposes of either belligerent, has commanded me to communicate to your lordships, for your guidance, the following rules, which are to be treated and enforced as her Majesty's orders and directions.

Her Majesty is pleased further to command that these rules shall be put in force in the United Kingdom, and in the Channel Islands, on and after Thursday, the 6th day of February next, and in her Majesty's territories and possessions beyond the seas, six days after the day when the governor or other chief authority of each of such territories or possessions, respectively, shall have notified and published the same, stating in such notification that the said rules are to be obeyed by all persons within the same territories and possessions.

1. During the continuance of the present hostilities between the government of the United States of North America and the States calling themselves the Confederate States of America, or until her Majesty shall otherwise order, no ships of war or privateers, belonging to either of the belligerents, shall be permitted to enter or remain in the port of Nassau, or in any other port, roadstead, or waters of the Bahama Islands, except by special leave of the lieutenant governor of the Bahama Islands, or in case of stress of weather. If any such vessel should enter any such port, roadstead, or waters, by special leave, or under stress of weather, the authorities of the place shall require her to put to sea as soon as possible, without permitting her to take in any supplies beyond what may be necessary for her immediate use.

If at the time when this order is first notified in the Bahama Islands, there shall be any such vessel already within any port, roadstead, or waters of those islands, the lieutenant governor shall give notice to such vessel to depart, and shall require her to put to sea within such time as he shall, under the circumstances, consider proper and reasonable. If there shall then be ships of war or privateers belonging to both the said belligerents within the territorial jurisdiction of her Majesty, in or near

the said port, roadstead, or waters, the lieutenant governor shall fix the order of time in which such vessels shall depart. No such vessel of either belligerent shall be permitted to put to sea until after the expiration of at least twenty-four hours from the time when the last preceding vessel of the other belligerent (whether the same shall be a ship of war, or privateer, or merchant ship) which shall have left the same port, roadstead, or waters adjacent thereto, shall have passed beyond the territorial jurisdiction of her Majesty.

2. During the continuance of the present hostilities between the government of the United States of North America and the States calling themselves the Confederate States of America, all ships of war and privateers, of either belligerent, are prohibited from making use of any port or roadstead in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, or in the Channel Islands, or in any of her Majesty's colonies or foreign possessions, or dependencies, or of any waters subject to the territorial jurisdiction of the British Crown, as a station or place of resort for any warlike purpose, or for the purpose of obtaining any facilities of warlike equipment; and no ship of war or privateer of either belligerent shall hereafter be permitted to sail out of or leave any port, roadstead, or waters subject to British jurisdiction, from which any vessel of the other belligerent (whether the same shall be a ship of war, a privateer, or a merchant ship) shall have previously departed, until after the expiration of at least twenty-four hours from the departure of such last-mentioned vessel beyond the territorial jurisdiction of her Majesty.

3. If any ship of war or privateer, of either belligerent, shall, after the time when this order shall be first notified and put in force in the United Kingdom and in the Channel Islands, and in the several colonies, and foreign possessions, and dependencies of her Majesty respectively, enter any port, roadstead, or waters belonging to her Majesty, either in the United Kingdom or in the Channel Islands, or in any of her Majesty's colonies, or foreign possessions or dependencies, such vessel shall be required to depart and to put to sea within twenty-four hours after her entrance into such port, roadstead, or waters, except in case of stress of weather, or of her requiring provisions or things necessary for the subsistence of her crew, or repairs, in either of which cases the authorities of the port, or of the nearest port, (as the case may be,) shall require her to put to sea as soon as possible after the expiration of such period of twenty-four hours, without permitting her to take in supplies beyond what may be necessary for her immediate use; and no such vessel which may have been allowed to remain within British waters for the purpose of repair shall continue in any such port, roadstead, or waters, for a longer period than twenty-four hours after her necessary repairs shall have been completed: *Provided*, nevertheless, that in all cases in which there shall be any vessels (whether ships of war, privateers, or merchant ships) of both the said belligerent parties in the said port, roadstead, or waters within the territorial jurisdiction of her Majesty, there shall be an interval of not less than twenty-four hours between the departure therefrom of any such vessel (whether a ship of war, a privateer, or a merchant-ship) of the one belligerent, and the subsequent departure therefrom of any ship of war or privateer of the other belligerent; and the times hereby limited for the departure of such ships of war and privateers, respectively, shall always, in case of necessity, be extended so far as may be requisite for giving effect to this proviso, but not further or otherwise.

4. No ship of war or privateer, of either belligerent, shall hereafter be permitted, while in any port, roadstead, or waters subject to the territorial jurisdiction of her Majesty, to take in any supplies except provisions

and such other things as may be requisite for the subsistence of her crew, and except so much coal only as may be sufficient to carry such vessel to the nearest port of her own country, or to some nearer destination; and no coal shall be again supplied to any such ship of war or privateer, in the same or any other port, roadstead, or waters subject to the territorial jurisdiction of her Majesty, without special permission, until after the expiration of three months from the time when such coal may have been last supplied to her within British waters as aforesaid.

I have, &c.,

RUSSELL.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 232.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 16, 1862.

SIR: Your dispatch No. 137, the receipt of which has already been acknowledged, is accompanied by a note which was addressed to you by Earl Russell, in reply to your representations concerning the treatment of the United States ship of war the *Flambeau*, at Nassau. The approval of the British government of the proceedings of the governor in that place is regarded by the President as unfriendly towards a power that extends unrestricted hospitalities to the naval, as well as the mercantile, marine of Great Britain in its ports and harbors. The grievance is not sensibly alleviated by the fact that the government of her Majesty are able to reconcile it with a proclamation issued by her Majesty in May last, conceding the rights of a public belligerent to the insurgents in arms against the United States. The explanation obliges us to renew the declaration this government has so often made, that it regards the proclamation itself as unnecessary, unfriendly, and injurious.

The history of the past year is a record of serious embarrassments of legitimate commerce between the two countries, resulting from the concession of belligerent naval rights to a seditious party in the United States which has never had control of a single port or harbor in its own country. It cannot be the desire of the British government either to reduce the commerce heretofore carried on between the two countries, so profitably to both of them, or to suffer occasional irritations to ripen into fruits of animosity between them. You will, therefore, present the inconveniences complained of to the notice of her Majesty's government as an argument for the revision of that proclamation whenever, in the exercise of your discretion, you shall think such a revision can be pressed for with hope of a candid hearing. The review of our military position, which I submit in a collateral dispatch, induces us to hope that such a time is near at hand.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 275.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 23, 1862.

SIR: I send you a copy of a report made by Lieutenant Charles McDougal, of the United States navy, dated April 13, 1862 showing that,

in pursuance of orders from the British admiralty, he had been required to remove the United States ship of war Saginaw from the colony of Hong Kong, in China, and its dependencies. The interests of American commerce in the east require the presence of American vessels there, and with it the enjoyment of all the rights of maritime powers. No British interest can be injuriously affected by the presence of such vessels. But, on the other hand, their presence is beneficial to the interests of all the western powers. You will please make the fact communicated by Lieutenant McDougal known to Earl Russell, as a pregnant illustration of the unnecessary and injurious operations of the attitude held by the British government in regard to the insurrection existing in the United States. We shall no further urge a change of that attitude, having exhausted the argument. But it will occur to every one that the American people are not likely to be always satisfied with performing treaty stipulations without reciprocity.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[Inclosures printed with dispatch, No. 188, of Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward, dated July 17, 1862, *post.*]

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 188.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, July 17, 1862.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit a copy of my note to Lord Russell in relation to the course taken by the harbor-master of Hong Kong towards the United States vessel the Saginaw. Copies of the papers inclosed, with your dispatch (No. 275) of the 23d of June, relating to that subject, accompanied my note.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, July 14, 1862.

MY LORD: I am directed to lay before your lordship copies of dispatches transmitted to me, touching the action of the harbor-master at Hong Kong, in relation to the United States steamer Saginaw. There certainly does seem to be a difference between the treatment experienced by this vessel and that applied to the Sumter in Gibraltar.

But, apart from this, it is needless to suggest to your lordship that the presence of some vessel of war in the China seas is almost indispensable to the protection of the interests of American commerce in that quarter, or that a denial of any of the ordinary rights of maritime powers operates with peculiar hardship upon them in this instance. On the other hand, it does not appear that any British interest could be seriously affected by the admission of such vessels to the enjoyment of them.

Thus far experience may be said to have shown it to advance the interests of all the western powers. Under these circumstances I have been instructed simply to submit the facts to the consideration of her Majesty's government.

Praying your lordship to accept the assurances of my highest consideration, I have the honor to be, my lord, your most obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANCOIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

Lieutenant McDougal to Mr. Welles.

UNITED STATES STEAMER SAGINAW,
Macao, April 13, 1862.

SIR: I have the honor to report the following:

The anticipated troubles with England having subsided, on the 19th ultimo I removed this vessel from this place to Hong Kong, deeming Hong Kong to be the better place for carrying out any instructions I might receive from the department concerning her.

On the 5th instant I received a call from the harbor-master, who informed me that he had been instructed to notify me to remove the United States steamer Saginaw from Hong Kong, at the same time handing me a letter containing the notification and enclosing a proclamation just issued by the governor, all of which I inclose.

There being no other course for me to pursue than that of complying with the requirements made, on the 10th instant I got under way and steamed over to this place, where I shall await instructions from the department.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

CHARLES J. McDOUGAL,

Lieut. U. S. Navy, in charge of U. S. Steamer Saginaw.

Hon. GIDEON WELLES,

Secretary of the Navy, Washington, D. C.

The Harbor-Master at Hong Kong to Lieutenant McDougal.

No. 3.]

HARBOR-MASTER'S OFFICE,
Hong Kong, April 4, 1862.

SIR: I have the honor to inclose a proclamation issued by his excellency the governor, having reference to the hostilities which are now carried on between the States of North America, which have seceded from the Union, and those which adhere to it, and, in compliance with its provisions, beg to request you will be good enough to remove the United States sloop of war Saginaw, under your command, from the colony of Hong Kong and its dependencies.

I have the honor to be, sir, your most obedient servant,

H. G. THOMSETT, Harbor-Master, &c.

The OFFICER COMMANDING

United States sloop of war Saginaw.

23 A C—VOL. I

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 198.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, July 31, 1862.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit copies of two more notes, which have been exchanged here since my last dispatch, (No. 188,) touching the case of the United States steamer Saginaw and her warning to leave the port of Hong Kong.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

HON. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *July 25, 1862.*

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 14th instant, in which you call attention to the circumstances under which the United States steamer Saginaw had been required to quit the harbor of Hong Kong, in compliance with the terms of her Majesty's proclamation of the 31st of January last. You draw, at the same time, a comparison between the course thus adopted towards the Saginaw and that which had been followed with regard to the Sumter, at Gibraltar.

I have, in reply, to observe that the difference between the circumstances of the two cases lies in the fact that the Sumter was in the waters of Gibraltar before the proclamation had been issued by her Majesty's government, whereas it appears that the Saginaw went to Hong Kong subsequently to its issue.

In framing the regulations contained in the proclamation, her Majesty's government have acted on the principle of impartiality, but the effect has been greatly to the advantage of the United States cruisers and to the disadvantage of those of the Confederate States.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, July 28, 1862.

MY LORD; I have the honor to acknowledge the reception of your note of the 25th instant, in answer to mine of the 14th, touching the case of the United States steamer Saginaw. In reply to my suggestion of a seeming difference of treatment experienced at Gibraltar in the case of the Sumter, and at Hong Kong in the case of that vessel, your lordship remarks that it is to be attributed to the fact that the Sumter was in the waters of Gibraltar before the proclamation had been issued, whereas the Saginaw went to Hong Kong subsequently to its issue.

If by this it be understood that the date of issue of the proclamation in London is the rule applied to vessels happening to be at the most remote dependencies of Great Britain, I must admit that these two cases are not precisely parallel. My impression had been that that paper was not designed to have a retroactive operation, but that it went into effect, as is often the case in treaties, from the date of reception and notice by the local government of the distant colony to which it was to apply. In that view, it would seem that the *Saginaw* had arrived at Hong Kong more than a fortnight prior to the issue of the governor's proclamation.

In making the representation respecting the case of the *Saginaw*, it was not, however, my desire to raise this question as one of primary importance. I rather wished to point out the exceptional nature of the China seas, in which all commercial nations seem to have a common interest in rendering to each other, so far as possible, a mutual support.

I pray your lordship to accept the assurance of the highest consideration with which I have the honor to be, my lord, your most obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, *&c.*, *&c.*, *&c.*

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 324.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, August 14, 1862.

SIR: Your dispatch of July 31st (No. 198) is before me. I confess my surprise at the hesitation of the British government in regard to admitting our cruisers into their ports in China. The Chinese are engaged in civil war, which threatens the safety of not only all western commerce but of the foreign residents, of whatever country, in China. Practically, and by force of circumstances, we are allies with the British in protecting that commerce, and all those residents, against the belligerent parties; there never has been, and I feel quite assured that there never will be, an insurgent American vessel of any kind in the Chinese seas. The exclusion of our vessels, therefore, seems unnecessary upon any ground that the British government has assumed, while it is injurious to Great Britain and other western nations, as well as the United States.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., *&c.*, *&c.*, *&c.*

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 534.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, November 13, 1863.

SIR:

My attention has been already called to the existence of the joint application of the British and French authorities to the United States, alluded to in the copy of your dispatch to Mr. Dayton, which accompanied your No. 741, and to the possibility of making use of it in the

present emergency. The difficulty is that the answer is too obvious. The request was to refuse to receive privateers. The two governments affect to consider the vessels now complained of as war ships, commissioned by a belligerent power. Not to receive them would involve the necessity of refusing to receive those of the United States, or else of appearing to depart from the declared neutrality.

The original error, committed in a hasty and unqualified recognition of the rebels as a belligerent, is what vitiates all the later policy of both these powers, and entangles Great Britain more especially in the difficulties growing out of the necessity to recognize these vessels, equipped and manned in her own ports, in defiance of her own laws, as the navy of a foreign power.

There has been little done in the *Alexandra* case this week, beyond the assignment of Tuesday next, in the court of exchequer, as the time to hear the law officers of the crown on the motion for a new trial.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 1, 1863, p. 41.]

No. 46.

Earl Russell to Lord Lyons.

[Extract.]

FOREIGN OFFICE, November 28, 1862.

Although the matter to which I now refer is not of recent date, I think it as well that a formal record should exist of the language held by Viscount Palmerston to Mr. Adams, in a conversation which took place in the early part of the present year, when the United States steamer "*Tuscarora*" and the confederate steamer "*Nashville*" were in British waters.

Lord Palmerston stated to Mr. Adams, on the occasion in question, that her Majesty's government could not permit any interference with any vessel, British or foreign, within British waters; that with regard to vessels met with at sea, her Majesty's government did not mean to dispute the belligerent rights of the United States ships of war to search them, but that the exercise of that right, and the right of detention in certain conditions, must in each case be dealt with according to the circumstances of the case; and that it was not necessary for him to discuss such matters then, because they were not in point; but that it would not do for the United States ships to harrass British commerce on the high seas, under pretence of preventing the confederates from receiving things that are contraband of war.

I took an opportunity of mentioning to Mr. Adams the account which Lord Palmerston had given me of the language which he had thus held, and Mr. Adams agreed in its accuracy.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 611.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, March 10, 1864.

SIR:

I have the honor to transmit a copy of the Times, of the 8th of March, containing a report of some remarks in Parliament the evening before, on certain topics connected with rebel operations on the ocean. * *

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

[For inclosure see Parliamentary and Judicial Appendix, No. 5.]

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 871.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 11, 1864.

SIR: Your dispatch of the 26th of February (No. 606*) is before me. I learn from it that on the 25th of February you had a conversation with Earl Russell concerning the conflicts and collisions which, during the last few months, have arisen out of the abuses of neutrality by emissaries of the insurgents, and their abettors in British ports and provinces. It is an occasion of sincere regret that the conversation was necessarily a hurried one, and that it did not encourage us to expect a remedy for the evils which were discussed. This regret is increased by the announcement of two important events bearing upon the subject: First, that her Majesty's government have reversed their decision in the case of the *Tuscaloosa* and ordered her to be set at liberty, after having previously determined that she should be detained and given up to her American owners; and, secondly, that the judicial authorities of New Brunswick have released the pirates of the Chesapeake, who were arrested at St. John's, and have declined to give them up upon the requisition of this government under the treaty for extradition. The explanation which Lord Lyons has given us of the first decision is, that the law officers of the Crown hold that although the *Tuscaloosa* might have been lawfully detained under orders which had recently been transmitted to the cape, yet that, as she had once before those orders visited the cape, and had been permitted to depart, she might reasonably have supposed that she would be again received in the same way, and, therefore, that she ought not to have been seized and detained on this occasion, without previous notice of the new orders.

In regard to the other case, we learn that the decision which operates against us as a defeat of justice, rests upon legal objections entertained by the court. Thus in these cases, as in those of the *Alabama*, the *Alexandra*, and the steam rams at Lairds' ship yard, we meet disappointments at every stage and constantly increasing embarrassments, resulting from judicial or executive interpretation of municipal law or the law of nations, under which active and restless enemies, without a port or lawful ship, save to themselves privileges as a naval belligerent in the neutral ports of Great Britain.

* [Printed under the head of "*The Alabama*."]

The government of the United States cherish a profound respect for the government of Great Britain, and we entertain as much deference towards the judicial and legal authorities of that country as any aggrieved nation has ever conceded to the tribunals of the aggrieving party. But it can hardly be expected that such respect and confidence will be effective enough to induce a great commercial nation to acquiesce in, and submit to, a practical destruction of its navigation and to injurious and dangerous assaults upon its domestic peace, in violation of all previous principles of maritime law. For this reason, the government of the United States has not at any time thought it proper or wise to follow the British courts and counselors of the Crown, like a private litigant, and successively modify its appeals and remonstrances in conformity to successive orders, decrees and judgments of British tribunals, which, as we think, necessarily partake of the uncertainty and caprice incident everywhere to the civil administration of justice. On the contrary, the United States have constantly referred themselves to the wisdom and magnanimity of her Majesty's executive government, who are exclusively charged by the British nation with the duty of regulating its intercourse and maintaining peace and harmony with foreign states.

It was seen, as we thought, early in the month of December last, that British ports, at home and abroad, situate in a line that extends through a considerable portion of the earth, were becoming a base for operations hostile and dangerous to the United States. The constantly growing evidences of this painful condition of things have been presented by you to her Majesty's government, with a fullness and directness that have perhaps tried the patience of Great Britain. There was a special class of evidence having the same practical tendency which fell within the direct observation of her Majesty's government, namely, the multiplied complaints preferred to them by subjects of the Queen, of rigor and severity incurred by them, at the hands of this government, in maintaining the rights and interests of the United States. It has been respectfully submitted to her Majesty's government that the condition of things thus disclosed, which our experience shows to be little less than actual war, but which prudent statesmen may, nevertheless, truly regard as a prelude to unmeditated war, has resulted from no proceeding of the government or people of the United States against Great Britain or her subjects, but has, on the contrary, resulted from the policy which Great Britain has adopted, and the proceedings which her subjects have practiced in regard to the United States. We remonstrated against that policy at every stage of its development, and expressed our conviction that it would be followed only by complications such as are now deplored. At the same time, we have abstained from demanding or suggesting to her Majesty's government any particular form of remedy; and we rested satisfied with asking that government to do something which would relieve the painful situation into which the country had been brought. This course was adopted because it was thought to be one which was entirely consistent with the honor of the United States, and with the respect which they owe to Great Britain. Earl Russell in his conversation with you, as we understand it, has given you no reason to hope that anything whatever will be done. The United States are not disposed to attribute this attitude to any sentiment of injustice or unfriendliness on the part of that government; they willingly assume that it results from the difficulty of fixing the national attention upon a new and annoying foreign question, and securing for it the serious consideration which is required. However this may be, it is necessary for us to accept the

situation as it is, and to decide upon the further course of this government in regard to it. You are, therefore, informed that it will be agreeable to the President if her Majesty's government, instead of dismissing our complaint, will continue to hold it under consideration with a desire to find some change of policy which shall tend to prevent the further commission of injuries against the United States by British subjects or American insurgents going from British ports or possessions.

The President, while maintaining the rights and authority of the United States, and guarding against the dangers of the situation, will nevertheless continue to consider with candor and to act with justice upon the increasing mass of complaints which her Majesty's minister here is instructed to present for investigation and redress. The President will, moreover, exercise his influence to prevent the growth of injurious and retaliatory proceedings against Great Britain. But he thinks it proper to say that he believes that he possesses no influence adequate to induce satisfaction or contentment with the condition of affairs as it now exists.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 669.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, April 22, 1864.

SIR: I have received from Mr. Burlingame, at Peking, by way of Irkutsk, a telegram dated the 24th of March, to the following effect:

"Inform them at Washington that the Chinese government, on my demand, has issued a proclamation forbidding the use of the waters and harbors of China to the confederate cruisers, as well as to furnish them any supplies."

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 721.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, June 16, 1864.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit a copy of a note this day received from Lord Russell, with a printed inclosure, being an extract from the London Gazette of the 15th of December, 1863. I annex a copy of my note in reply.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Lord Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *June 15, 1864.*

SIR: The regulations issued by her Majesty on the 31st of January, 1862, for the preservation of neutrality during the existing hostilities in North America, prescribe, as you are no doubt aware, that no ship of war or privateer, belonging to either of the belligerents, shall enter or remain in the port of Nassau, or any other port, roadstead, or waters of the Bahama islands, except by special leave of the lieutenant governor, or in case of stress of weather. It is, therefore, with regret that I have to state that it has been represented to her Majesty's government that vessels of war belonging to the United States are in the habit of resorting to the more distant and least populous of the Bahama out-islands in disregard of those regulations.

I beg leave to instance the case of the United States gunboat *Tioga*, which is reported to her Majesty's government to have anchored without permission in the roadstead of Bimini on the 12th of April last. On that occasion a boat rowing eight oars, and having several officers in her, proceeded for the shore, and when they were met by the police magistrate of Abaco, who represented to them that their presence there was contrary to the Queen's regulations, they are stated to have expostulated, and to have asserted that they were permitted to remain there twenty-four hours.

This proceeding on the part of the United States gunboat *Tioga* could not, however, be excused on the ground of ignorance of the Queen's regulations, for it appears that the commander's attention had been called to these regulations a short time before, on the occasion of the *Tioga's* having entered Little Harbor, Abaco; neither could it be justified on the score of stress of weather, as the weather at Bimini on the 12th of April last is stated to have been "delightfully fine."

It has been further represented to her Majesty's government that this particular gunboat has made frequent visits to the Bahama out-islands for the purpose of obtaining supplies; and even admitting that advantage has not been taken of these visits to commit acts inconsistent with her Majesty's neutrality, these visits are not the less a violation of the Queen's regulations, and as such are deserving of reprehension.

I must, therefore, request that you will have the goodness to call the attention of your government to this subject; and I have the honor to inclose copies of the regulations referred to, to which is appended an explanatory instruction, issued by the Secretary of State for the colonies on the 6th of October last.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[Extract from the London Gazette of the 15th of December, 1863.]

FOREIGN OFFICE, *December 15, 1863.*

Copies of a letter from Earl Russell to the lords commissioners of the admiralty, and of a dispatch from the Duke of Newcastle to the governor of the Bahamas:

FOREIGN OFFICE, *January 31, 1862.*

MY LORDS: Her Majesty being fully determined to observe the duties during the existing hostilities between the United States

and the States calling themselves the "Confederate States of America," and being, moreover, resolved to prevent, as far as possible, the use of her Majesty's harbors, ports, and coasts, and the waters within her Majesty's territorial jurisdiction, in aid of the warlike purposes of either belligerent, has commanded me to communicate to your lordships, for your guidance, the following rules, which are to be treated and enforced as her Majesty's orders and directions:

Her Majesty is pleased further to command that these rules shall be put in force in the United Kingdom and in the Channel islands on and after Thursday, the 6th day of February next, and in her Majesty's territories and possessions beyond the seas, six days after the day when the governor or other chief authority of each of such territories or possessions, respectively, shall have notified and published the same, stating in such notification that the said rules are to be obeyed by all persons within the same territories and possessions.

I. During the continuance of the present hostilities between the government of the United States of North America and the States calling themselves "the Confederate States of America," or until her Majesty shall otherwise order, no ship of war or privateer, belonging to either of the belligerents, shall be permitted to enter or remain in the port of Nassau, or in any other port, roadstead, or waters of the Bahama Islands, except by special leave of the lieutenant governor of the Bahama Islands, or in case of stress of weather. If any such vessel should enter any such port, roadstead, or waters, by special leave, or under stress of weather, the authorities of the place shall require her to put to sea as soon as possible, without permitting her to take in any supplies beyond what may be necessary for her immediate use.

If, at the time when this order is first notified in the Bahama Islands, there shall be any such vessel already within any port, roadstead, or waters of those islands, the lieutenant governor shall give notice to such vessel to depart, and shall require her to put to sea, within such time as he shall, under the circumstances, consider proper and reasonable. If there shall then be ships of war or privateers belonging to both the said belligerents within the territorial jurisdiction of her Majesty, in or near the same port, roadstead, or waters, the lieutenant governor shall fix the order of time in which such vessels shall depart. No such vessel of either belligerent shall be permitted to put to sea until after the expiration of at least twenty-four hours from the time when the last preceding vessel of the other belligerent (whether the same shall be a ship of war, or privateer, or merchant ship) which shall have left the same port, roadstead, or waters, or waters adjacent thereto, shall have passed beyond the territorial jurisdiction of her Majesty.

II. During the continuance of the present hostilities between the government of the United States of North America and the States calling themselves "the Confederate States of America," all ships of war and privateers, of either belligerent, are prohibited from making use of any port or roadstead in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, or in the Channel Islands, or in any of her Majesty's colonies or foreign possessions or dependencies, or of any waters subject to the territorial jurisdiction of the British crown, as a station or place of resort for any warlike purpose, or for the purpose of obtaining any facilities of warlike equipment; and no ship of war or privateer of either belligerent shall hereafter be permitted to sail out of or leave any port, roadstead, or waters subject to British jurisdiction, from which any

vessel of the other belligerent (whether the same shall be a ship of war, a privateer, or a merchant ship) shall have previously departed, until after the expiration of at least twenty-four hours from the departure of such last-mentioned vessel beyond the territorial jurisdiction of her Majesty.

III. If any ship of war or privateer, of either belligerent, shall, after the time when this order shall be first notified and put in force in the United Kingdom and in the Channel Islands, and in the several colonies and foreign possessions and dependencies of her Majesty, respectively, enter any port, roadstead, or waters belonging to her Majesty, either in the United Kingdom or in the Channel Islands, or in any of her Majesty's colonies or foreign possessions or dependencies, such vessel shall be required to depart and to put to sea within twenty-four hours after her entrance into such port, roadstead, or waters, except in case of stress of weather, or of her requiring provisions or things necessary for the subsistence of her crew or repairs; in either of which cases the authorities of the port, or of the nearest port, (as the case may be,) shall require her to put to sea as soon as possible after the expiration of such period of twenty-four hours, without permitting her to take in supplies beyond what may be necessary for her immediate use; and no such vessel, which may have been allowed to remain within British waters for the purpose of repair, shall continue in any such port, roadstead, or waters for a longer period than twenty-four hours after her necessary repairs shall have been completed: *Provided, nevertheless*, That in all cases in which there shall be any vessels (whether ships of war, privateers, or merchant ships) of both the said belligerent parties in the same port, roadstead, or waters within the territorial jurisdiction of her Majesty, there shall be an interval of not less than twenty-four hours between the departure therefrom of any such vessel (whether a ship of war, a privateer, or a merchant ship) of the one belligerent, and the subsequent departure therefrom of any ship of war or privateer of the other belligerent; and the times, hereby limited, for the departure of such ships of war and privateers, respectively, shall always, in case of necessity, be extended, so far as may be requisite for giving effect to this proviso, but not further or otherwise.

IV. No ship of war or privateer of either belligerent shall hereafter be permitted, while in any port, roadstead, or waters subject to the territorial jurisdiction of her Majesty, to take in any supplies, except provisions and such other things as may be requisite for the subsistence of her crew, and except so much coal only as may be sufficient to carry such vessel to the nearest port of her own country, or to some nearer destination; and no coal shall be again supplied to any such ship of war or privateer in the same or any other port, roadstead, or waters subject to the territorial jurisdiction of her Majesty, without special permission, until after the expiration of three months from the time when such coal may have been last supplied to her within British waters as aforesaid.

I have, &c.,

RUSSELL.

NOTE.—A similar letter has been addressed to the secretaries of state for the home, colonial, war, and India departments, and to the lords commissioners of her Majesty's treasury.

DOWNING STREET, *October 6, 1863.*

SIR: Doubts having been expressed as to whether, under the regulations of the 31st January, 1862, which were embodied in a proclamation issued by you on the 11th March following, it is required that the commander of a belligerent ship of war or privateer should obtain the permission of the local authorities before entering the ports, roadsteads, or waters of the Bahama out-islands, when the governor is not there present, I am to acquaint you that Earl Russell has taken her Majesty's pleasure thereupon, and you are to understand that at the ports of the out-islands, as at Nassau, the special leave of the governor himself is required (unless in stress of weather) by any belligerent vessel desiring to enter, with this exception only: that in cases of grave emergency and real necessity and distress, such as a sailing vessel being dismasted, or accident happening to the machinery of a steam vessel, the vessel may enter the ports, roadsteads, or waters, on obtaining leave from a resident officer, to whom the governor shall have delegated his authority in that behalf.

With a view to give effect to her Majesty's intentions, you will be pleased to convey to the officers in the out-islands to whom it may best be confided the authority in question, taking care to communicate to them copies of the regulations of the 31st January, 1862, and calling their especial attention to the limits of the authority delegated, and to that clause of the regulations of 31st January, 1862, in which it is directed that vessels entering under stress of weather, or by special leave, shall be required to put to sea as soon as possible.

I have, &c.,

NEWCASTLE.

Governor BAYLEY, *C. B., &c., &c., &c.*

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, June 16, 1864.

MY LORD: I have the honor to acknowledge the reception of your note of the 15th instant, in relation to certain proceedings of the commander of the United States gunboat *Tioga*, at the Bahama Islands, represented to be in violation of the regulations made by her Majesty's government in regard to the reception at the ports in those islands, of vessels engaged in the present war in America, two printed copies of which have been at the same time furnished to me, with a request that I would call the attention of my government to the subject.

In accordance with your lordship's desire, I shall seize the first opportunity to transmit this representation to my government, from whom I do not doubt that the subject will meet with the most prompt consideration.

I pray your lordship to accept the assurances of the highest consideration with which I have the honor to be, my lord, your most obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, *&c., &c., &c.*

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 723.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, June 17, 1864.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith two papers* just issued by her Majesty's government; one being "instructions to governors of colonies, respecting the treatment of prizes captured by federal or confederate cruisers if brought into British waters;" and the other, a return of the number and tonnage of American vessels sold to British subjects in the year 1863.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Circular instructions to governors of colonies respecting the treatment of prizes captured by federal or confederate cruisers if brought into British waters.

DOWNING STREET, June 2, 1864.

SIR: I think it well to communicate to you the decisions at which her Majesty's government have arrived on certain questions which have arisen respecting the treatment of prizes captured by federal or confederate cruisers if brought into British waters.

1. If any prize captured by a ship of war, of either of the belligerent powers, shall be brought by the captors within her Majesty's jurisdiction, notice shall be given by the governor to the captors immediately to depart and remove such prize.

2. A vessel which shall have been actually and *bona fide* converted into and used as a public vessel of war shall not be deemed to be a prize within the meaning of these rules.

3. If any prize shall be brought within her Majesty's jurisdiction through mere stress of weather, or other extreme and unavoidable necessity, the governor may allow for her removal such time as he may consider to be necessary.

4. If any prize shall not be removed at the time prescribed to the captors by the governor, the governor may detain such prize until her Majesty's pleasure shall be made known.

5. If any prize shall have been captured by any violation of the territory or territorial waters of her Majesty, the governor may detain such prize until her Majesty's pleasure shall be made known.

Her Majesty's government have not thought it necessary to make any addition to the instructions already given with respect to cargoes, viz., that her Majesty's orders apply as much to prize cargoes of every kind which may be brought by any armed ships or privateers of either belligerent into British waters as to the captured vessels themselves. They do not, however, apply to any articles which may have formed part of any such cargoes if brought within British jurisdiction, not by armed ships or privateers of either belligerent, but by other persons who may have acquired or may claim property in them by reason of any dealings with the captors.

These rules are for the guidance of the executive authority, and are

* Second inclosure omitted.

not intended to interfere in any way with the process of any court of justice.

I have, &c.,

EDWARD CARDWELL.

Mr. Burnley to Mr. Seward.

WASHINGTON, September 9, 1864.

SIR: I have been requested by his excellency the lieutenant governor of Nova Scotia to acquaint you with the inclosed orders in council, directing that vessels-of-war of the United States of America, or of the so-called Confederate States, entering or approaching the immediate vicinity of the harbor of Halifax, shall in future anchor in the usual man-of-war anchorage abreast of the naval yard.

I shall feel greatly obliged if you would be good enough to cause this order to be made generally known to all commanders of federal cruisers likely to visit that port.

It has been adopted solely with a view of carrying out in the most impartial manner the orders of her Majesty the Queen for the observance of a strict neutrality toward both belligerents, and I feel convinced that the federal authorities will be happy to afford every assistance toward effecting that object.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

J. HUME BURNLEY.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD, &c., &c., &c.

Orders in council.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE, August 29, 1864.

[Extract from minutes.]

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

Present: His excellency Sir Richard Graves Macdonnell, C. B., lieutenant governor, &c., &c., &c.; the Honorable Charles Tupper, provincial secretary; Honorable W. A. Henry, attorney general; Honorable James McNab, receiver general; Honorable Isaac Le Vesconte, financial secretary; Honorable S. Leonard Shannon.

It is ordered, That if any ship of war or privateer of the United States of America, or of the States calling themselves the Confederate States of America, shall come into the port of Halifax, or within the territorial jurisdiction of her Majesty in the vicinity of the said port, every such vessel of war or privateer aforesaid shall immediately come to anchor off the naval yard, unless prevented by stress of weather; and in the latter event, shall be required to anchor as aforesaid as soon as the weather will permit.

Pilots and all other officers of the port are commanded (on boarding or hailing any such ship or privateer) to communicate the foregoing order to the chief officer on duty of every ship of war or privateer aforesaid.

A true copy:

JAMES H. THORNE,
Clerk Executive Council.

Mr. Burnley to Mr. Seward.

WASHINGTON, *September 23, 1864.*

SIR: I have the honor to transmit to you herewith copies of a notification issued by her Majesty's government prohibiting any ship of war, belonging to either of the belligerent powers in North America, being dismantled or sold in any of her Majesty's ports.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

J. HUME BURNLEY.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD, *&c., &c., &c.*

[From the London Gazette 9 September, 1864.]

FOREIGN OFFICE, *September 8, 1864.*

It is hereby notified that her Majesty has been pleased to order, that for the future no ship of war belonging to either of the belligerent powers of North America shall be allowed to enter, or to remain, or be, in any of her Majesty's ports for the purpose of being dismantled or sold; and her Majesty has been pleased to give directions to the commissioners of her Majesty's customs, and to the governors of her Majesty's colonies and foreign possessions, to see that this order is properly carried into effect.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams,

No. 1310.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 20, 1865.

SIR: I have to acknowledge the receipt of your dispatch of the 2d of March, No. 886, in which you inform me that Lord Lyons has retired from the legation here, on the ground of ill health, and that the vacant post has been assigned to Sir Frederick Bruce. Simultaneously I have received a kind farewell note from Lord Lyons. We give up his lordship with sincere sorrow for the cause of his resignation, and unaffected regret upon the loss of his labors in the interest of peace and friendship between the two nations.

We are prepared to receive Sir Frederick Bruce kindly, and to judge him favorably. His name is connected, on this continent, with the memories of two eminently just and liberal representatives of Great Britain, Lord Ashburton and Lord Elgin.

I thank you sincerely for your suggestions in regard to the tone and spirit of our discussions upon questions affecting the British nation. It seems by no means certain that any course of proceeding is open to us which will satisfy, at once, the wishes of the British nation, and at the same time command justly the confidence of the people of the United States.

I think, however, that the manifest weakness of the rebels at home, together with the sudden and complete drying up of the springs of their credit in Europe, will tend to abate the interested favor they have hitherto enjoyed there. Our recent modification of the passport order, which restores free intercourse with Canada, and our reconsideration of the motion to abrogate the restrictions upon armaments upon the upper

lakes, was favorably received here, and they have relieved Canada of apprehensions of hostile intentions on our part, without weakening her resolve to maintain peace upon the border. I shall be disappointed if these benign measures shall not have a soothing influence in England.

The article in the London Times to which you have called my attention betrays a fatuity which inexcusably exceeds that of the rebels. The recent operations of Sherman, Grant, Sheridan, Schofield, Canby, and Thomas, have fully satisfied the insurgents, even though they have failed to convince the Times, that this government is not proposing an offensive and defensive alliance with them to wage war against Great Britain for the conquest of Canada. But, on the other hand, while we can safely and justly disclaim all purposes or thoughts of aggression, we cannot any longer defer our claims for a rescinding of European regulations which deny us safety for our mercantile marine upon the ocean, and reciprocity for our navy in European waters.

You will express my thanks to Baron Brunow for his suggestions. We know his motives to be sincere and friendly, and we have great respect for his judgment.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. F. W. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 1350.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 12, 1865.

SIR: I transmit herewith a printed copy of three proclamations of the 11th instant, made by the President of the United States: one relating to the closing of certain ports of entry; another supplementary thereunto and relating to the port of Key West, in Florida; and a third relating to reciprocal hospitalities to the vessels of foreign navies in the ports of the United States, and to vessels of the navy of the United States in foreign ports. You will perceive by these proclamations that it is believed that the time has arrived when the United States (whatever claim or pretense may have existed heretofore to the contrary) are now entitled to claim the same friendly rights and hospitalities for their naval vessels which they are willing to concede to those of all maritime nations.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

F. W. SEWARD,
Acting Secretary.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

By the President of the United States of America.

A PROCLAMATION.

Whereas by my proclamations of the nineteenth and twenty-seventh days of April, one thousand eight hundred and sixty-one, the ports of the United States in the States of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas, were declared to be subject to blockade; but whereas the said blockade has, in consequence of actual military occupation by this government, since

been conditionally set aside or relaxed in respect to the ports of Norfolk and Alexandria, in the State of Virginia; Beaufort, in the State of North Carolina; Port Royal, in the State of South Carolina; Pensacola and Fernandina, in the State of Florida; and New Orleans, in the State of Louisiana;

And whereas, by the fourth section of the act of Congress, approved on the thirteenth of July, eighteen hundred and sixty-one, entitled "An act further to provide for the collection of duties on imports and for other purposes," the President, for the reasons therein set forth, is authorized to close certain ports of entry:

Now, therefore, be it known, that I, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States, do hereby proclaim that the ports of Richmond, Tappahannock, Cherrystone, Yorktown, and Petersburg, in Virginia; of Camden, (Elizabeth City,) Edenton, Plymouth, Washington, Newbern, Ocracoke, and Wilmington, in North Carolina; of Charleston, Georgetown, and Beaufort, in South Carolina; of Savannah, St. Mary's, and Brunswick, (Darien,) in Georgia; of Mobile, in Alabama; of Pearl River, (Shieldsborough,) Natchez, and Vicksburg, in Mississippi; of St. Augustine, Key West, St. Mark's, (Port Leon,) St. John's, (Jacksonville,) and Apalachicola, in Florida; of Teche, (Franklin,) in Louisiana; of Galveston, La Salle, Brazos de Santiago, (Point Isabel,) and Brownsville, in Texas, are hereby closed, and all right of importation, warehousing, and other privileges, shall, in respect to the ports aforesaid, cease until they shall have again been opened by order of the President; and if, while said ports are so closed, any ship or vessel from beyond the United States, or having on board any articles subject to duties, shall attempt to enter any such port, the same, together with its tackle, apparel, furniture, and cargo shall be forfeited to the United States.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand, and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington, this eleventh day of April, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-five, and of [L. S.] the independence of the United States of America the eighty-ninth.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

By the President:

WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

By the President of the United States of America.

A PROCLAMATION.

Whereas by my proclamation of this date, the port of Key West, in the State of Florida, was inadvertently included among those which are not open to commerce:

Now, therefore, be it known, that I, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States, do hereby declare and make known that the said port of Key West is and shall remain open to foreign and domestic commerce upon the same conditions by which that commerce has there hitherto been governed.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington, this eleventh day of April, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-five, and of [L. s.] the independence of the United States of America the eighty-ninth.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

By the President:

WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

By the President of the United States of America.

A PROCLAMATION.

Whereas for some time past vessels of war of the United States have been refused, in certain foreign ports, privileges and immunities to which they were entitled by treaty, public law, or the comity of nations, at the same time that vessels of war of the country wherein the said privileges and immunities have been withheld have enjoyed them fully and uninterruptedly in ports of the United States, which condition of things has not always been forcibly resisted by the United States, although, on the other hand, they have not at any time failed to protest against and declare their dissatisfaction with the same; [and whereas] in the view of the United States, no condition any longer exists which can be claimed to justify the denial to them, by any one of such nations, of customary naval rights, as has heretofore been so unnecessarily persisted in:

Now, therefore, I, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States, do hereby make known, that if, after a reasonable time shall have elapsed for intelligence of this proclamation to have reached any foreign country, in whose ports these said privileges and immunities shall have been refused, as aforesaid, they shall continue to be so refused, then and thenceforth the same privileges and immunities shall be refused to the vessels of war of that country in the ports of the United States, and this refusal shall continue until war vessels of the United States shall have been placed upon an entire equality in the foreign ports aforesaid with similar vessels of other countries. The United States, whatever claim or pretense may have existed heretofore, are now, at least, entitled to claim and concede an entire and friendly equality of rights and hospitalities with all maritime nations.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed:

Done at the city of Washington, this eleventh day of April, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-five, and of [L. s.] the independence of the United States of America the eighty-ninth.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

By the President:

WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Hunter to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 1404.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 16, 1865.

SIR: * * * * * * * *

I inclose for your information and guidance two copies of the President's proclamation of the 10th instant, in regard to the insurgent cruisers, one copy of which you will communicate to the government to which you are accredited.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

W. HUNTER,
Acting Secretary.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[For inclosed copy of proclamation see dispatch No. 973 of Mr. Adams to Mr. Hunter, dated June 2, 1865 *post.*]

Mr. Adams to Mr. Hunter.

No. 962.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, May 19, 1865.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith copies of a correspondence between Earl Russell and the lords commissioners of her Majesty's treasury, just published in the newspapers, revoking the order of his lordship of 31st January, 1862, regulating the visits of the United States ships of war to British ports.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM HUNTER,
Acting Secretary of State.

Correspondence between Earl Russell and the lords commissioners of her Majesty's treasury.

"TREASURY CHAMBERS; *May 12, 1865.*

"GENTLEMEN: With reference to previous correspondence, I am commanded by the lords commissioners of her Majesty's treasury to transmit to you herewith, for your information and guidance, a copy of a letter from the Foreign Office, dated 11th instant, in regard to a modification of the regulations for the treatment of war vessels belonging to the belligerent States in North America which may arrive at ports in her Majesty's dominions.

"G. A. HAMILTON.

"The COMMISSIONERS OF CUSTOMS."

[Copy of letter referred to.]

"FOREIGN OFFICE, *May 11, 1865.*

"MY LORDS: I have the honor to acquaint your lordships that in the existing state of the civil war in America, and the uncertainty which may

be felt as to its continuance, it appears to her Majesty's government that the time has arrived for ceasing to enforce so much of the orders which, in pursuance of my letter of the 31st January, 1862, were issued by the several departments of her Majesty's government as empowered the authorities of any port belonging to her Majesty, either in the United Kingdom or in the Channel Islands, or in any of her Majesty's colonies, or foreign possessions or dependencies, to require any ship of war or privateer of either belligerent which might enter any port, roadstead, or waters belonging to her Majesty, in order to obtain provisions or things necessary for the subsistence of her crew, or to effect repairs, to put to sea as soon as possible after the expiration of a period of twenty-four hours, without permitting her to take in supplies beyond what might be necessary for her immediate use, and not to suffer any such vessel as might have been allowed to remain within British waters for the purpose of repair, to continue in any port, roadstead, or waters belonging to her Majesty for a longer period than twenty-four hours after the necessary repairs should have been completed, and also so much of the same orders as limited the quantity of coal, and the period within which it might be obtained, to be embarked on board any such ship of war or privateer of either belligerent.

"I have addressed a similar letter to the secretaries of state for the home, colonial, war, and India departments, and the lords commissioners of the admiralty.

"I have, &c.,

"RUSSELL.

"The LORDS COMMISSIONERS OF HER MAJESTY'S TREASURY."

"CUSTOM-HOUSE, *London*, May 13, 1865.

"The foregoing copy of a letter from Mr. Hamilton, one of the secretaries to the lords of the treasury, dated 11th instant, together with copy of the letter from the Foreign Office therein referred to, is transmitted to the collector at _____ for his government.

"By order of the commissioners,

"J. B. HALE."

Mr. Adams to Mr. Hunter.

[Extract].

No. 973.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, June 2, 1865.

SIR: * * * * * * *

With respect to the matters referred to in your Nos. 1401 and 1404, I presume that the next steamer due in the United States, after the date of these dispatches, will have brought you the answer of Lord Russell to my inquiries made under former instructions, as transmitted to you with my No. 952, of the 11th of May, relative to the same subject. I am, therefore, inclined to await an exposition of the President's views after he shall have become possessed of that answer, rather than renew the inquiry here with a prospect of a similar response. Nevertheless, I have transmitted to his lordship, as you desired in No. 1404, a copy of the President's proclamation of the 10th of last month. It has elicited an acknowledgment in

his lordship's note of the 30th ultimo, which appears to indicate a still more favorable disposition. I transmit herewith a copy of that note.

I am rather inclined to the belief that no further action will be necessary on this matter.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM HUNTER,

Acting Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,

London, May 29, 1865.

MY LORD: I have the honor to communicate to your lordship herewith, for the information of her Majesty's government, a printed copy of a proclamation in regard to insurgent cruisers, issued by the President of the United States, at Washington City, on the 10th instant.

Renewing the assurances of my highest consideration, I have the honor to be, my lord, your lordship's most obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. Earl RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

[Relative to insurgent cruisers, May 10, 1865.]

By the President of the United States of America.

A PROCLAMATION.

Whereas the President of the United States, by his proclamation of the nineteenth day of April, one thousand eight hundred and sixty-one, did declare certain States therein mentioned in insurrection against the government of the United States; and whereas armed resistance to the authority of this government in the said insurrectionary States may be regarded as virtually at an end, and the persons by whom that resistance, as well as the operations of insurgent cruisers, was directed, are fugitives or captives; and whereas it is understood that some of those cruisers are still infesting the high seas, and others are preparing to capture, burn, and destroy vessels of the United States:

Now, therefore, be it known, that I, Andrew Johnson, President of the United States, hereby enjoin all naval, military, and civil officers of the United States diligently to endeavor, by all lawful means, to arrest the said cruisers, and to bring them into a port of the United States, in order that they may be prevented from committing further depredations on commerce, and that the persons on board of them may no longer enjoy impunity for their crimes.

And I do further proclaim and declare that if, after a reasonable time shall have elapsed for this proclamation to have to become known in the ports of nations claiming to have been neutrals, the said insurgent cruisers and the persons on board of them shall continue to receive hospitality in the said ports, this government will deem itself justified in refusing hospitality to the public vessels of such nations in ports of the United States,

and in adopting such other measures as may be deemed advisable towards vindicating the national sovereignty.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington, this tenth day of May, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-five, and of the [L. S.] independence of the United States of America the eighty-ninth.

ANDREW JOHNSON.

By the President:

W. HUNTER, *Acting Secretary of State.*

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, May 30, 1865.

SIR: I have had the honor to receive your letter of yesterday, communicating, for the information of her Majesty's government, a printed copy of a proclamation issued by the President of the United States, at Washington, on the 10th instant, regarding insurgent cruisers.

I observe it stated in this proclamation that "armed resistance to the authority of this government in the said insurrectionary States may be regarded as virtually at an end. The persons by whom that resistance, as well as the operations of insurgent cruisers, was directed, are fugitives or captives."

Her Majesty's government will deem it their duty to communicate immediately with the government of France, in order to concert measures whereby the insurgent cruisers shall no longer continue to receive hospitality in the ports of Great Britain and France.

Her Majesty's government will subsequently communicate to the same purpose and effect with other maritime nations who, like the British government, have pursued a course of neutrality during the late civil war.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Hunter.

No. 977.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, June 2, 1865.

SIR: I have just returned from a brief interview with Lord Russell, and beg leave to report the substance of it.

I read to him the substance of your dispatch (No. 1400) of the 15th of May. With reference to the first remark contained in it, I interposed the observation that, so far as my experience went, I had not perceived in his lordship the impatience referred to; but I presumed it would nevertheless be agreeable to him to know that the matter was engaging the attention of my government. After I had gone through with it, his lordship simply remarked, that inasmuch as the British government had recognized the validity of the closing of the ports of which we were in possession, there was no disposition to be impatient in respect to any proceedings which we might deem it advisable to adopt in our progress to restoration. There had been some complaints of hardship from British subjects in Charleston; but these were an unavoidable consequence

of the peculiar state of affairs, which he presumed would be but temporary. He trusted that the government would be able, in due course of time, to bring matters back to their ordinary state.

I then added that I had received another dispatch relating to the arrival of the *Stonewall* at Nassau, and the general question of belligerent rights; but considering that the matter must have been already communicated to him through a letter which had been addressed to Sir Frederick Bruce, and, further, that I held it to be substantially settled by his answer to my note transmitting a copy of the President's proclamation, I should not trouble him by reading it.

His lordship observed that he had learned through Lord Cowley that Mr. Bigelow, our minister at Paris, had communicated to M. Drouyn de Lhuys a dispatch on this subject. He asked if I had any of the same kind. I replied that I did not know of any special one to Mr. Bigelow, and I had not, myself, anything more than I had already mentioned. He said the matter had been occupying the attention of both governments, and, on their own part, they had come to a conclusion. The substance of it was to recognize the war at an end, and from the same date to refuse to receive any vessel of the insurgents within British ports. With regard to such vessels as might happen to be in any port prior to the declaration, if in process of disarmament for sale and transfer to neutral parties, that would be permitted without any guarantee of security on leaving the port. If, on the other hand, the vessel should be armed, it would be required to depart in twenty-four hours under the rule.

I remarked that, being without authority, I could only express my own opinion of this proceeding; but I could not help thinking it would be perfectly satisfactory. The subject had seemed to me so near to settling itself, that I had not felt any anxiety of late about it. There were but two vessels left on the ocean, the *Shenandoah* and the *Stonewall*. I had strong reason to believe they had already been disposed of by persons in this country who were undertaking to dispose of the assets of the bankrupt concern. Indeed, it had been intimated to me that they had been already ordered to repair to this kingdom. If they should not reach here prior to the issue of the proposed declaration, did I understand his lordship right in saying admission would be refused them? His lordship took up a document which was before him, and read me a passage of it precisely to that effect. Whereupon I remarked that I was satisfied. It might be that my government would desire to pursue these miserable vessels further, as it would have a clear right to do; but, in my mind, nothing that they could do would weigh a feather more upon the general result, which was now made certain.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM HUNTER,
Acting Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Circular.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 7, 1865.

SIR: It is proper that you should be informed that the Secretary of the Navy has, by direction of the President, issued orders to Rear-Admiral

Goldsborough, who is about to start in the steamship Colorado, as commander of the United States squadron in European waters, to the following effect:

The admiral is charged not to enter any port, unless absolutely necessary, where belligerent privileges may be extended to the United States rebels, or where naval honors are, by governmental authority, withheld from the flag of the United States. If an emergency should compel him to enter such a port, he is to refrain from all courtesies required by the navy regulations in friendly foreign ports, unless to return salutes.

The admiral is also forbidden to exchange any of the customary courtesies with the officers of foreign governments whom he may meet, which governments extend belligerent privileges to the insurgents in this country, or deny customary naval courtesies to the United States.

It is proper that, as occasion may require, you should make this subject known to the proper persons in the country where you reside.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[Same to our principal ministers in Europe.]

Mr. Adams to Mr. Hunter.

No. 990.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, June 15, 1865.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit a copy of the London Times containing a report of some remarks made in the House of Lords on the 12th instant, by Lords Derby and Russell, on the subject of the President's late proclamation closing the ports of Texas. These matters are so rapidly made obsolete by the march of events that it seems scarcely worth while to dwell on them particularly. If the United States ceases to carry on war, it necessarily ceases to be a belligerent, or to have belligerent rights; but it does not, thereby, debar itself from the right of pursuing on the ocean any vessel without a national character—*hostem humani generis*—which may be found attempting to destroy or plunder the merchant ships of the United States. This is legitimate work for all civilized nations, which are equally aggrieved by the presence of a pirate on the ocean. It is to be hoped that before this time the last of the vessels open to any such imputation will have been so disposed of as to put to rest all further agitation of the subject in connection with the late rebellion.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

HON. WILLIAM HUNTER,
Acting Secretary of State.

[For debate referred to see Parliamentary and Judicial Appendix, No. 7.]

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 1454.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 19, 1865.

SIR: I transmit for your information a copy of a correspondence between Sir Frederick W. A. Bruce and this department, and of a letter

of this date which I have addressed to the Secretary of the Navy, on the subject of the withdrawal by Great Britain of the concession of belligerent rights to the insurgents.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCOIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Sir F. Bruce.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, June 19, 1865.

SIR: Due consideration has been given to a dispatch which Earl Russell addressed to you on the 2d of June, instant, and of which, on the 14th instant, you were so kind as to leave a copy at this department. The President is gratified by the information which that paper contains, to the effect that her Majesty's government have determined to consider the war which has lately prevailed between the United States and the insurgents of this country to have ceased *de facto*, and that her Majesty's government now recognized the re-establishment of peace within the whole territory of which the United States were in undisturbed possession at the beginning of the civil war.

The President is also gratified to learn from Earl Russell's dispatch that her Majesty's government will forthwith send to her Majesty's authorities in all ports, harbors, and waters belonging to her Majesty, whether in the United Kingdom or beyond the seas, orders henceforth to refuse admission into any such ports, harbors, and waters, of any vessel of war carrying the insurgent flag, and to require any insurgent vessels of war which, after the time that the orders may be received by her Majesty's authorities, may have already entered such ports, and which, having complied with the previous proclamations of the British government, may be actually within such ports, harbors, and waters, forthwith to depart from the same.

It is with regret, however, that I have to inform you that Earl Russell's aforesaid dispatch is accompanied by some explanations and reservations which are deemed unacceptable by the government of the United States.

It is hardly necessary to say that the United States do not now admit what they have heretofore constantly controverted, that the original concession of belligerent privileges to the rebels by Great Britain was either necessary or just, or sanctioned by the law of nations.

The correspondence which took place between this government and that of her Majesty at an early stage of the insurrection shows that the United States deemed the formation of a mutual engagement by Great Britain with France, that those two powers would act in concert with regard to the said insurrection, to be an unfriendly proceeding, and that the United States, therefore, declined to receive from either of those powers any communication which avowed the existence of such an arrangement. I have, therefore, now to regret that Earl Russell has thought it necessary to inform this government that her Majesty's government have found it expedient to consult with the government of France upon the questions whether her Majesty's government will now recognize the restoration of peace in the United States.

It is a further source of regret that her Majesty's government avow that they will continue still to require that any United States cruisers which shall hereafter be lying within a British port, harbor, or waters,

shall be detained twenty-four hours, so as to afford an opportunity for an insurgent vessel, she actually being within the said port, harbor, or waters, to gain the advantage of the same time for her departure from the same port, harbor, or waters.

It is a further source of regret that her Majesty's government have deemed it proper to make the additional reservation in favor of insurgent vessels of war that for the period of a whole month, which shall elapse after the new orders now to be issued by her Majesty's government shall have been received by the said authorities, any insurgent vessel which may be found in, or may enter any port, harbor, or waters of her Majesty's dominions, and which may desire to divest itself of its warlike character and to assume the flag of any nation recognized by her Majesty's government with which her Majesty is at peace, will be allowed to do so; and further, that such vessels, after disarming themselves, will be permitted to remain in such ports, harbors, or waters without an insurgent flag, although the twenty-four hours' rule will not be applicable to the cases of such vessels. Far from being able to admit the legality or justice of the instruction thus made, it is my duty to inform your excellency that, in the first place, the United States cannot consent to an abridgement of reciprocal hospitalities between the public vessels of the United States and those of Great Britain. So long as her Majesty's government shall insist upon enforcing the twenty-four hours' rule before mentioned, of which the United States have so long, and, as they think, so justly complained, the United States must apply the same rule to public vessels of Great Britain.

Again, it is my duty further to state that the United States cannot admit, and, on the contrary, they controvert and protest against, the decision of the British government which would allow vessels of war of insurgents or pirates to enter or to leave British ports, whether for disarmament or otherwise, or for assuming a foreign flag or otherwise. As to all insurgent or piratical vessels found in ports, harbors, or waters of British dominions, whether they entered into such ports, harbors, or waters before or after any new orders of her Majesty's government may be received by any authority of her Majesty's government established there, this government maintains and insists that such vessels are forfeited to and ought to be delivered to the United States, upon reasonable application in such cases made, and that if captured at sea, under whatever flag, by a naval force of the United States, such a capture will be lawful.

Notwithstanding, however, the exceptions and reservations which have been made by her Majesty's government, and which have been herein considered, the United States accept with pleasure the declaration by which her Majesty's government have withdrawn their former concession of a belligerent character to the insurgents; and this government further freely admits that the normal relations between the two countries being practically restored to the condition in which they stood before the civil war, the right to search British vessels has come to an end by an arrangement satisfactory in every material respect between the two nations.

It will be a source of satisfaction to this government to know that her Majesty's government have considered the views herein presented in a spirit favorable to the establishment of a lasting and intimate friendship between the two nations.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK W. A. BRUCE, &c., &c., &c.

[Communicated by the British legation, June 14, 1865, and referred to in the preceding note.]

Earl Russell to Sir F. Bruce.

FOREIGN OFFICE, June 2, 1865.

SIR: I received, on the 25th ultimo, your dispatch of the 10th ultimo, inclosing a copy, taken from a newspaper, of a proclamation issued by the President of the United States on that day, declaring, among other matters, that "armed resistance to the authority of this government," namely, the government of the United States, "may be regarded as virtually at an end, and the persons by whom that resistance, as well as the operations of insurgent cruisers, were directed are fugitives or captives."

On the day following the receipt of your dispatch intelligence reached this country of the capture of President Davis by the military forces of the United States.

In this state of things her Majesty's government lost no time in communicating with the government of the Emperor of the French as to the course which should be pursued by the two governments; and while these communications were in progress I received officially from Mr. Adams, on the 30th ultimo, a copy of the President's proclamation of the 10th.

It would, indeed, have been more satisfactory if the government of the United States had accompanied the communication of the President's proclamation with a declaration that they formally renounced the exercise, as regards neutrals, of the rights of a belligerent; but her Majesty's government considers that, in the existing posture of affairs, the delay of any formal renunciation to that effect did not afford to neutral powers sufficient warrant for continuing to admit the possession of a belligerent character by a confederation of States which had been actually dissolved. The late President of the so-called Confederate States has been captured, and transported as a prisoner to Fort Monroe; the armies hitherto kept in the field by the Confederate States have for the most part surrendered or dispersed; and to continue to recognize those States as belligerents would not only be inconsistent with the actual condition of affairs, but might lead to much embarrassment and complication in the relations between the neutral powers and the government of the United States.

Her Majesty's government have accordingly, after communication with the government of the Emperor of the French, determined to consider the war which has lately prevailed between the United States and the so-called Confederate States of North America to have ceased *de facto*, and on that ground they recognize the re-establishment of peace within the whole territory of which the United States, before the commencement of the civil war, were in undisturbed possession.

As a necessary consequence of this recognition her Majesty's government will forthwith send to her Majesty's authorities in all ports, harbors, and waters belonging to her Majesty, whether in the United Kingdom or beyond the seas, orders henceforth to refuse admission into any such ports, harbors, and waters of any vessel of war carrying a confederate flag, and to require any confederate vessels of war which, at the time that the orders may be received by her Majesty's authorities, may have already entered such ports, harbors, and waters on the faith of proclamations heretofore issued by her Majesty, and which, having complied with the provisions of such proclamations, may be actually within such ports, harbors, and waters, forthwith to depart from the same.

But in adopting this decision, as regards confederate vessels of war

found within British ports, harbors, and waters when the orders are received by her Majesty's authorities, her Majesty's government considers that a due regard for national good faith and honor requires that her Majesty's authorities should be instructed that any confederate vessels of war so required to depart should, on their departure, have the benefit of the prohibition heretofore enforced against their being pursued within twenty-four hours by a cruiser of the United States, lying at the time within the same port, harbor, and waters; and that such prohibition should be then and for the last time maintained in favor of such confederate vessels of war. Her Majesty's government cannot anticipate any objection being made by the government of the United States to this reserve when the ground on which it is adopted is explained to that government.

Her Majesty's government have, however, thought it right to provide for the contingency of the commander of any confederate vessel of war which may be found in any port, harbor, or waters of her Majesty's dominions at the time when these new orders are received by her Majesty's authorities, or may enter such port, or harbor, or waters within a month after these new orders are received, desiring to divest his vessel of her warlike character, and to assume the flag of any nation recognized by her Majesty's government as in a state of peace with her Majesty; and in such a case her Majesty's authorities will be authorized to allow the commander of the vessel to do so; and after disarming her, to remain without a confederate flag, within British waters, at his own risk in all respects; in which case such commander will be distinctly apprised that he is to expect no further protection from her Majesty's government, except such as he may be entitled to in the ordinary course of the administration of the law in time of peace. The rule as to twenty-four hours would not be applicable to the case of such vessel.

I have to instruct you to lose no time in making known to the government of the United States, by communicating to the Secretary of State a copy of this dispatch, the course of action on which her Majesty's government have decided, and which, they doubt not, will be agreeable to the government of the United States. But in making this communication to the Secretary of State, you will add, that her Majesty's government have adopted this course under the full persuasion that the government of the United States will, on their part, at once desist from exercising toward neutrals the rights of blockade, and of search and detention of neutral vessels on the high seas, which can be lawfully exercised by belligerents alone, and which a power not engaged in warfare cannot, under the law of nations, assume to exercise.

I have, &c.,

RUSSELL.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BRUCE, G. O. B., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Welles.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 19, 1865.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit for your information a correspondence between Sir Frederick W. A. Bruce and this department upon the subject of the withdrawal of the pretended concession of belligerent rights to the insurgents. In view of this correspondence, I suggest, therefore, that

you communicate to the naval officers of the United States the results following therefrom, namely: First, Great Britain withdraws her concession, heretofore made, of a belligerent character from the insurgents; secondly, that the withdrawal of the twenty-four-hours rule has not been made absolute by Great Britain, and that, therefore, the customary courtesies are not to be paid by our vessels to those of the British navy; thirdly, the right of search of British vessels is terminated, (of course this has no bearing upon the operations of the existing slave-trade treaty;) fourthly, any insurgent or piratical vessels found on the high seas may be lawfully captured by vessels of the United States.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

Hon. GIDEON WELLES, *Secretary of the Navy.*

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 1473.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 3, 1865.

SIR: I inclose for your information a copy of a letter of the 22d ultimo addressed by the Secretary of the Navy to Rear-Admiral Goldsborough upon the subject of the withdrawal from the insurgents of the character of belligerents, and the proceedings of the Navy Department in view thereof.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Welles to Rear-Admiral Goldsborough.

NAVY DEPARTMENT, June 22, 1865.

SIR: Information has been communicated to this department by the Secretary of State that the imperial government of France has moved all restrictions heretofore imposed by it upon naval intercourse with the United States, and has withdrawn from the insurgents the character of belligerents.

The government of Great Britain also withdraws her concession heretofore made of a belligerent character from the insurgents, but the withdrawal of the twenty-four-hours rule has not been made absolute; reciprocal measures will be extended to the vessels of that country.

The blockade of the ports and coast of the United States will soon cease, and with the cessation of hostilities the belligerent right of search will also cease.

Very respectfully,

G. WELLES,
Secretary of the Navy.

Rear-Admiral L. M. GOLDSBOROUGH,
Commanding European Squadron.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 1485.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 25, 1865.

SIR: * * *

In my No. 1454 I inclosed to you a copy of the dispatch of the 2d of June, from Earl Russell to Sir Frederick Bruce, and of my note to Sir Frederick, in reply, of the 19th of the same month, upon the subject of the withdrawal of belligerent rights by Great Britain from the insurgents. In that reply you will have found, and I hope to hear that you have been guided by, the views of this government in regard to the disposition to be made of a certain class of vessels found in British ports.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCOIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 1401.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 25, 1865.

SIR: Referring to instructions Nos. 1854 and 1473, I now communicate to you, in order that you may be fully in possession of the correspondence on the subject, a copy of a note of the 20th of June, from Sir Frederick Bruce, and of my reply of the 1st instant, in relation to the construction to be placed upon a passage in Earl Russell's dispatch of the 2d of June, concerning the twenty-four hours' rule.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCOIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Sir F. Bruce to Mr. Seward.

WASHINGTON, *June 20, 1865.*

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your note of the 19th instant, relative to Earl Russell's dispatch to me of the 2d June, copy of which I left at the State Department, and I have forwarded a copy of that note to her Majesty's government.

It is not within my province to discuss the general observations therein contained on the dispatch in question; but, as the construction I put on its terms differs on one important point from that contained in the note you have done me the honor to address to me, I venture to submit at once the views I entertain of its intention for your consideration.

In that note it is stated that "her Majesty's government avow that they will continue still to require that any United States cruisers which shall hereafter be lying within a British port, harbor, or waters, shall be detained twenty-four hours, so as to afford an opportunity for an insurgent vessel then actually being within the said port, harbor, or waters to gain the advantage of the same time for her departure from the same port, harbor, or waters."

On a mature consideration of the terms of Earl Russell's dispatch, its intention appears to me to be different from the statement contained in the above extract. I understand it to lay down that the benefit of the twenty-four hours' rule is withdrawn from the so-called confederate vessels of war, and that the only exception to this decision will occur under the following circumstances:

If a vessel of this description is lying in a British port when these fresh instructions are received by her Majesty's authorities, the said vessel having already entered that port on the faith of previous proclamations, and if a cruiser of the United States is lying in the same port, the said vessel is *then and for the last time* to enjoy the benefit of the twenty-four hours' rule.

According to my view, therefore, the case can only arise once on the receipt by her Majesty's authorities of the instructions alluded to in Earl Russell's dispatch; nor do I understand that, except in the particular and improbable contingency above mentioned, there will be any deviation hereafter from the rules of intercourse as practiced toward the vessels of war of a friendly state.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

FREDERICK W. A. BRUCE.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Sir F. Bruce.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 1, 1865.

SIR: I hasten, immediately after my return to the seat of government, to reply to your note of the 20th of June last, which was duly received at this department.

The President is pleased to know that, in your excellent opinion, the application, in certain cases contemplated by her Majesty's government, of the twenty-four hours' rule to naval vessels of the United States in British ports, harbors, and waters, is more guarded than had been supposed when my note addressed to you on the 19th of June was written.

It is the desire of the United States that, as far as possible, all injurious effects of the questions which have arisen between this government and that of Great Britain during the internal disturbances which have prevailed in this country for the last four years may be removed. We hail, therefore, as of good augury every demonstration of liberality and consideration which comes to us from her Majesty's government.

I have the honor to be, with high consideration, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK W. A. BRUCE, &c., &c., &c.

Sir F. Bruce to Mr. Seward.

WASHINGTON, July 3, 1865.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your note of the 1st instant, in reply to the explanation I offered of the meaning of the dis-

patch of Earl Russell to me of the 2d June, copy of which I communicated to the government of the United States.

It is with much satisfaction that I shall communicate a copy of the note to her Majesty's government by this day's mail.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

FREDERICK W. A. BRUCE.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Hunter to Mr. Adams.

No. 1495.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 28, 1865.

SIR: Your dispatch of the 13th instant, No. 1011, relating to the incidents connected with the case of the Rappahannock, has been received.

Instruction No. 1485, of the 25th instant, expresses a hope which you have well anticipated in your proceedings thus far in regard to this vessel and others of its class. The nature and extent of the judicial steps which may be necessary to secure their delivery to the authorities of the United States are left to your discretion to determine upon, and due provision will be made for the payment of such expenses as may be thus incurred; but I cannot forbear from remarking, that a course on the part of her Majesty's government similar to that pursued by Spain in surrendering the Stonewall, while it would show only a just consideration for the rights of the United States, and would relieve you of the labor of superintending the details of judicial proceedings, would unquestionably exert a happy effect upon the relations between the two countries; I would therefore suggest that you address to Earl Russell a communication with that object in such terms as your judgment may dictate.

I inclose for your information a copy of the correspondence relating to the surrender of the Stonewall.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

W. HUNTER,
Acting Secretary.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Moran to Mr. Seward.

LONDON, July 28, 1865.

MY DEAR SIR: Mr. Adams directs me to forward the inclosed letter and bill in the case of the United States *vs.* Prioleau, and to say that, as the report of the hearing has not been received by him, he will be obliged to postpone sending it until next week.

I am, my dear sir, with great respect, your very obedient servant,
BENJAMIN MORAN.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

[For inclosure see Parliamentary and Judicial Appendix, No. 8.]

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 1025.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, August 3, 1865.

SIR: I have the honor now to transmit a full report of the proceedings in the court of chancery in the case of the cotton claimed by the United States.

I have reason to believe that the decision of the vice-chancellor is regarded with some distrust in its possible bearing upon the other proceedings against the vessels in the admiralty court. If it be once admitted that the acts of the late rebel agents are valid to change the property in their hands, it becomes difficult to dispute any disposition they may have chosen to make of it. There is good reason for believing that most of the vessels have passed through some form or other of transfer to private hands. The law, however, seems to me so clear in regard to the invalidity of any transfer of the armed vessels of a belligerent to neutral parties that I cannot suppose any doubt will be entertained of the decision to that extent. There may, however, be a little more question in regard to any transfer of that class of vessels which cannot be proved to have been absolutely employed in carrying on hostilities.

My own opinion has been in favor of at least pressing the courts to a clear decision in all the cases. Difficulties have been made about proving absolute ownership in the rebel authorities, which are characteristic of the proclivities of the profession in this kingdom. All that I can say is, that such difficulties were not regarded as serious by the Crown lawyers of this government, when it became necessary to determine the character of the very dubious vessel, the Nashville. The distrust usually perceptible in pushing any claims, however apparently well grounded, on behalf of the United States, in the courts, has now made itself apparent to me, and impaired my confidence in ultimate success. Nevertheless I have felt it my duty to omit no step on that account which the national dignity would seem to demand in maintenance of its just rights.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

[For inclosure see Parliamentary and Judicial Appendix, No. 8.]

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 1032.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, August 10, 1865.

SIR: In respect to the matter referred to in your dispatch No. 1485, of the 25th of July, you will before this have been informed by me of the steps which I assumed the responsibility to take in advance of your instructions. The only doubt which I feel is as to the mode of proceeding which I selected, a doubt which is fortified by my general observation of the tendency of all movements conducted by the lawyers of this country on behalf of the United States in British courts. On the other hand, had a direct demand been made upon the British government for the surrender of the vessels in question, I feel very sure that we should only have been thrown back to the same resource in the end. The

language of Lord Russell's notes on the subject appears to me clearly to show that. Inasmuch as you must have been put in possession of a knowledge of the movements actually initiated by me soon after the date of your latest dispatches received here, I shall await the communication of your impressions respecting them before writing any more.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No 1507.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, August 10, 1865.

SIR: I have to acknowledge the receipt of your dispatch No. 1022, together with papers which contain an interlocutory decree which has been made by the vice-chancellor in a suit of the United States against Prioleau and others, which suit was instituted for the recovery of one thousand three hundred and fifty-six bales of cotton. A copy of the vice-chancellor's reasons for the interlocutory decree is found among the same papers. The vice-chancellor is understood to have affirmed the title of the United States to the property in question. It is with the judgment of the vice-chancellor, and not with the reasons that he assigns for such judgment, that the United States are concerned. In this view of the subject it might seem proper for this government to leave the subject unnoticed. The frankness, however, which ought to be practiced in the proceedings of states, requires an explanation of the views which this government has taken of the questions which the vice-chancellor has discussed in his reasons before mentioned.

The United States do not admit that the combination of disloyal citizens which has raised the standard of insurrection is now, or has at any previous time been, a government *de facto*, or in any sense a political power, capable of taking, holding, giving, asserting, or maintaining corporate rights in any forum—whether municipal or international. It is true that a different view of the character of the insurgents has seemed to find favor with some portions of the British nation, and even with the British government. It must be remembered, however, as equally true, that so often as that antagonistical opinion has been advanced by her Britannic Majesty's government in its intercourse with the United States, it has been firmly, though, as we trust, always courteously denied.

The United States controvert and deny the declaration of the vice-chancellor, that they are "successors" of the rebellion; and on the contrary, they maintain that they are now, and during all the time of the rebellion have been, just what they were before the rebellion began—a sovereign state, absolutely entitled to the regulation and control of all property and persons within the United States, subject only to the limitations of their own constitution.

It need hardly be said that the United States will hold themselves under no obligations whatever to accept of, or to conform their proceedings to, conditions which the court of chancery, or any other municipal court of Great Britain, may have the presumption to dictate or prescribe in the present or any other litigation. They claim and insist upon the restoration of the cotton now in question; and while they

are content to receive it through the decrees of the municipal tribunals of Great Britain, they insist upon their absolute right to the same through the action of her Britannic Majesty's government. You may instruct the counsel who are acting in behalf of the United States in the views herein expressed. Her Majesty's government have not in any way made themselves responsible for the positions assumed by the vice-chancellor, and therefore it would seem not only unnecessary, but even improper, to bring at the present time the subjects herein discussed to the attention of Earl Russell. If, however, you should discover that her Majesty's ministers are laboring under any misapprehension of the views of this government which should seem to need correction, you will supply such correction upon a proper occasion, and in a friendly and courteous manner.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 1509.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, August 12, 1865.

SIR: The Secretary of the Navy has communicated to this department a dispatch of the 24th ultimo, addressed to him by Rear-Admiral Goldsborough, from Flushing, which is accompanied by a copy of a letter addressed to him by you, which appears to be in answer to one from the admiral, in which he asked whether the British government still adhered to the application of the twenty-four-hours rule to the departure of our vessels being found in the same ports with them at the time of their arrival. Admiral Goldsborough asks whether, under the circumstances set forth in your letter, he is still to avoid the ports of England, and still decline to exchange courtesies and ceremonies with her naval and other authorities. To this inquiry this department has, under the instructions of the President, requested Mr. Welles to reply in the affirmative.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extracts.]

No. 1006.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, October 14, 1865.

SIR: I feel it my duty at once to transmit to you a copy of a paper issued from the Foreign Office directing that all restrictions on vessels of war of the United States be taken off in British ports. This was sent to me last night with a note from his lordship, * * * in which he also lets me know that the government has decided to send orders to Admiral Denman to detain the Shenandoah if she comes into any British port, and to capture her if found on the high seas.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Earl Russell to the Lords, &c., of Admiralty and Treasury, and others.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *October 13, 1865.*

MY LORDS: With reference to my letter of the 2d of June last, prescribing the course to be taken by her Majesty's several authorities in all ports, harbors, and waters belonging to her Majesty, whether in the United Kingdom or beyond the seas, in consequence of the recognition by her Majesty's government that peace was restored within the whole territory of which the United States of North America, before the commencement of the civil war, were in undisturbed possession; and with reference more particularly to that passage in my letter in which it was laid down that confederate vessels departing, in pursuance of requisitions to be made by her Majesty's authorities, from any ports, harbors, and waters belonging to her Majesty, in which, at the time of the receipt by those authorities of the fresh orders, such vessels might be found, should then and for the last time have the full benefit of the prohibition theretofore enforced against pursuit of them within twenty-four hours by a cruiser of the United States lying at the time within any such ports, harbors, and waters, I have the honor to state to your lordships that her Majesty's government are of opinion that it is desirable that her Majesty's naval and other authorities at home and in her Majesty's possessions abroad should be formally apprised that, as full time has now elapsed since my letter of the 2d of June for giving effect to the provisions of that letter, all measures of a restrictive nature on vessels of war of the United States in British ports, harbors, or waters are now to be considered as at an end, and that it is the desire and intention of her Majesty's government that unrestricted hospitality and friendship should be shown to vessels of war of the United States in all her Majesty's ports, whether at home or abroad.

I have addressed a similar letter to, &c.

I have, &c.,

RUSSELL.

THE LORDS, &c., OF THE ADMIRALTY AND TREASURY, Right Hons.
EDWARD CARDWELL, M. P., Sir GEORGE GREY, Bart., M. P.,
Sir CHARLES WOOD, Bart., M. P.

[Received at United States legation, London, October 13, 1865.]

Sir F. Bruce to Mr. Seward.

WASHINGTON, *October 30, 1865.*

SIR: I have the honor to inclose copy of a letter addressed by her Majesty's principal secretary of state for foreign affairs to the admiralty and other departments of her Majesty's government, directing that all measures of a restrictive nature on vessels of war of the United States in British ports, harbors, or waters are now to be considered at an end; and apprising them that it is the desire and intention of her Majesty's government that the most unrestricted hospitality and friendship should be shown to vessels of war of the United States in all her Majesty's ports, whether at home or abroad.

I am at the same time instructed to assure you of the satisfaction which

her Majesty's government have felt in issuing these orders to her Majesty's authorities.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

FREDERICK W. A. BRUCE.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD, &c., &c., &c.

Earl Russell to the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty.

FOREIGN OFFICE, October 13, 1865.

MY LORDS: With reference to my letter of the 2d of June last, prescribing the course to be taken by her Majesty's several authorities in all ports, harbors, and waters belonging to her Majesty, whether in the United Kingdom or beyond the seas, in consequence of the recognition by her Majesty's government that peace was restored within the whole territory of which the United States of North America before the commencement of the civil war were in undisturbed possession; and with reference more particularly to that passage in my letter, in which it was laid down that confederate vessels departing, in pursuance of requisitions to be made by her Majesty's authorities, from any ports, harbors, and waters belonging to her Majesty, in which at the time of the receipt by those authorities of the fresh orders such vessels might be found, should then, and for the last time, have the full benefit of the prohibition theretofore enforced against pursuit of them within twenty-four hours by a cruiser of the United States lying at the time within any such ports, harbors, and waters, I have the honor to state to your lordships that her Majesty's government are of opinion that it is desirable that her Majesty's naval and other authorities at home and in her Majesty's possessions abroad should be formally apprised that, as full time has now elapsed since my letter of the 2d of June for giving effect to the provisions of that letter, all measures of a restrictive nature on vessels of war of the United States in British ports, harbors, or waters, are now to be considered as at an end, and that it is the desire and intention of her Majesty's government that unrestricted hospitality and friendship should be shown to vessels of war of the United States in all her Majesty's ports, whether at home or abroad.

I have addressed a similar letter to the secretaries of state for the colonial, home, and India offices, and also to the lords commissioners of her Majesty's treasury.

I am, &c.,

RUSSELL.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 1572.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, October 31, 1865.

SIR: I have to acknowledge with much satisfaction the receipt of your dispatch of the 14th instant, No. 1066, transmitting a copy of a paper issued from the Foreign Office directing the withdrawal of all restrictions heretofore placed upon United States naval vessels in British ports and waters. I inclose for your information a copy of a letter upon the subject which I addressed to the Secretary of the Navy.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Welles.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, October 30, 1865.

SIR: I have the satisfaction of submitting for your information a copy of a dispatch which has just been received from Mr. Adams, together with its accompaniment, a copy of a note of Earl Russell, relating to the restrictions upon American national vessels which lately were maintained by her Majesty's government in British ports and waters.

The dispatch shows that all the objectionable restraints referred to have now been entirely removed, and that it is the desire and intention of her Majesty's government that unrestricted hospitality and friendship shall be shown to vessels of war of the United States in all her Majesty's ports, whether at home or abroad.

The President has directed me to make known to her Majesty's government his satisfaction with this pleasing manifestation of consideration and justice on the part of Great Britain. I have therefore to request you to inform the naval officers of the United States that the instructions which have heretofore been given them to make discriminations in regard to their visits in British ports and their intercourse with British naval vessels are now countermanded and withdrawn, and that henceforth most liberal hospitality and courtesy will be expected to be shown by the navy of the United States to the navy of Great Britain.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

Hon. GIDEON WELLES,
Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. Seward to Sir F. Bruce.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, October 31, 1865.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your note of yesterday's date, inclosing a copy of a letter addressed by her Majesty's principal secretary of state for foreign affairs to the admiralty and other departments of her Majesty's government, directing that all measures of a restrictive nature on vessels of war of the United States in British ports, harbors, and waters, are now to be considered at an end, and apprising them that it is the desire and intention of her Majesty's government that the most unrestricted hospitality and friendship should be shown to vessels of war of the United States in all her Majesty's ports, whether at home or abroad. In reply, I have the honor to state that, having received through Mr. Adams a copy of the order referred to, I have instructed him to express to Earl Russell the satisfaction with which this government regards the action of her Britannic Majesty's government.

I have the honor to be, with high consideration, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK W. A. BRUCE, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 5.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, June 7, 1861.

SIR:

I think I can report with confidence a considerable amelioration of sentiment here towards the government of the United States. This may be partly ascribed to the impression made by the news received of vigorous and effective measures in America, and partly to a sense that the preceding action of her Majesty's ministers has been construed to mean more than they intended by it. It cannot be denied that it had opened a most grave question touching the use that might be made of all the ports of Great Britain as a shelter for captures by privateers purporting to be authorized by the rebellious States. After a careful examination of the subject, I had come to the conclusion that, without some further positive action, the preceding practice in this country would authorize the retention of such captures until condemned as prizes in some admiralty court set up by the insurgents at home, and the sale of them afterwards. The effect of this, in giving them encouragement, can scarcely be estimated. It would at once enlist in their behalf most of the daring and desperate adventurers of every nation, whose sole object is plunder, and would initiate a struggle between a community of planters, who have nothing to lose on the ocean, and a commercial nation which whitens every sea with the sails of a peaceful navigation. That so serious a consequence as this was ever intended to flow from the precipitate act of the government here, I did not believe. Hence it was with great satisfaction that I learned, on Monday, that the question would be proposed on that day by Mr. Forster, in the House of Commons, which you will have seen before this in the record of the proceedings of that body, and that it would be fully answered by Lord John Russell on behalf of her Majesty's ministers. This answer, as since made, may be regarded as satisfactory, so far as it closes the door to one bad effect of the proclamation; but it does not remove the main difficulty of putting the legitimate and spurious authority in the same category. Although in practice the operation is favorable to the former, in theory the admission of equality is equally vicious. The only consolation is to be found in the evident desire betrayed by the government here to avoid in any way a collision with the United States or any direct encouragement of the insurgents.

This is the day assigned for the consideration of the motion of Mr. Gregory, the member for Galway. I understand that he means to enter largely into the question of recognition of the confederates, and that he will probably be answered as fully. It is stated to me that the ministry are willing to have the discussion go on. For obvious reasons I do not think it advisable to attend the debate myself; but I shall take measures to obtain the best information of the actual state of feeling in the House from personal observations, and to transmit my own conclusions in the next dispatch. Unfortunately it will be necessary to close the present one before evening, in order to be in time for the steamer.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

[For debate above referred to, see appendix No. 1.]

Mr. Dallas to Mr. Seward.

No. 333.] LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, May 2, 1861.

You have doubtless noticed that the motion of Mr. Gregory in the House of Commons, on the recognition of the southern confederation, which motion I mentioned at the conclusion of my No. 330, underwent postponement from the 16th to the 30th ultimo, and has again been deferred a fortnight, for the reasons stated in the extract from the Times newspaper of the 30th April, hereto annexed.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 1.] LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, May, 17, 1861.

Mr. Gregory yesterday gave notice of a postponement of the consideration of his motion until the 7th of June.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

No. 5.] LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, May 22, 1861.

Mr. Thouvenel, in the course of the conversation, took occasion to say that he deeply regretted the condition of things in the United States, and that in this expression of feeling he represented the views and feelings of the Emperor; that so deeply concerned was the Emperor, that he had felt disposed to offer his good offices, but had been deterred from

the fear that his offer might not be well received ; but should occasion for this arise he would always be ready and happy to be of use.

Your very obedient servant,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

LONDON, *June 8, 1861.*

DEAR SIR : I send herewith a copy of the London Times of this morning, containing an account of the termination of Mr. Gregory's movement.

Subsequent events only can now do anything to improve the prospect of the confederates at this court.

Yours, &c.,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

[For proceedings above referred to see "Parliamentary and Judicial Appendix," No. 1.]

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 15.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 8, 1861.

SIR :

I said that foreign intervention, aid, or sympathy in favor of the insurgents, especially on the part of Great Britain, manifestly could only protract and aggravate the war. Accordingly, Mr. Dallas, under instructions from the President, in an interview conceded to him by the British secretary of state for foreign affairs, presented our protest against any such intervention.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 16.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 8, 1861.

SIR: I enclose a copy of a note of this date addressed to Lord Lyons, which will dispel any uncertainty which the British government may entertain in regard to our recognition of a rule of international law which they may deem important.

I am, sir, respectfully your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Lord Lyons.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 8, 1861.

MY LORD: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your note of the 5th instant, with the accompanying papers, relative to a claim in the case of the cargo of the bark *Winifred*, a part of which is represented to belong to British subjects.

In reply, I regret that at this juncture I do not feel at liberty to interfere in the case, as it is understood that the usual proceedings in the prize court at New York have been set on foot against the vessel and her cargo.

If, however, that court shall be satisfied of the ownership by British subjects of the part of the cargo claimed, it cannot be doubted that restitution will be decreed, as this government recognizes the right of the property of a friendly nation in the vessels of an insurgent to be exempt from condemnation.

The papers which accompanied your note are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, your lordship's most obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

Right Hon. LORD LYONS, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

No. 13.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 8, 1861.

SIR: Your dispatch of May 22d (No. 5) has been received. Your safe arrival at your post of duty in this crisis, when our relations to foreign countries, and especially to France, have assumed a degree of interest and importance never known before since the Constitution was established, is a source of sincere satisfaction.

The President approves the sentiments you expressed on your presentation to his Imperial Majesty. The manner in which he received you, and the friendly expressions made by himself, as well as those which were employed by Mr. Thouvenel, although not unexpected, have given us the liveliest satisfaction.

We appreciate highly the Emperor's assurance that he would mediate between the government and the insurgents, with a view to the maintenance and preservation of the Union, if such intervention were deemed desirable by us; and that generous offer imposes a new obligation upon us toward France, which we acknowledge with sincere pleasure.

If mediation were at all admissible in this grave case, that of his Majesty would not be declined. But the present paramount duty of the government is to save the integrity of the American Union. Absolute, self-sustaining independence is the first and most indispensable element of national existence. This is a republican nation; all its domestic affairs must be conducted and even adjusted in constitutional republican forms and upon constitutional republican principles. This is an American nation, and its internal affairs must not only be conducted with reference to its peculiar continental position, but by and through American agencies alone. These are simple elementary principles of administration, no one of which can be departed from with safety in any

emergency whatever; nor could it be departed from with the public consent, which rightfully regulates, through constitutionally constituted popular authorities, the entire business of the government.

I have set them forth in no invidious, uncharitable, or ungenerous spirit. I state them fairly and broadly, because I know the magnanimity of the Emperor of France, and I know that he can appreciate directness and candor in diplomacy. I know, moreover, that he is a friend of the United States, and desires that they may continue one great and independent nation forever. I know still further that the principles I have thus stated will commend themselves to his own great wisdom. To invite or to accept mediation would be incompatible with these principles.

When all this has been said, you will then further say to Mr. Thouvenel, or to the Emperor, that if any mediation were at all admissible it would be his own that we should seek or accept.

You may say, at the same time, that this government has no apprehension whatever of its being unable to conduct our domestic affairs through this crisis to a safe conclusion; that consummation is even not far distant, if foreign powers shall practice towards us the same forbearance from intervention which we have habitually practiced towards them in emergencies similar to our own; that intervention by them would only protract and aggravate the civil war in which we are unhappily engaged; that civil war is a scourge to which we are more sensitive than any other people, but that the preservation of national unity, which is national existence, reconciles us to every form of difficulty and to the longest possible endurance of the trial in which we are engaged.

Other subjects mentioned in your dispatch will be the subject of a special communication after we shall have received the information from the French government which Mr. Thouvenel told Mr. Sanford that he should send with very little delay. It seems desirable to have the positions of the French government in regard to our affairs, as stated by itself, before we answer the inquiries bearing on the subjects to be discussed, which were referred to us through the conversation which took place at the time of your reception.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &co., &co., &co.

P. S.—I inclose a copy of a note of this date to Lord Lyons, which will dispel any uncertainty which the French government may entertain in regard to our recognition of a rule of international law which they may deem important.

[Printed with dispatch No. 16, dated June 8, 1861, from Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams, *ante*.]

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

[Extract.]

No. 26.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 6, 1861.

SIR: * * * * *

The President is highly gratified by the disposition which Mr. Thouvenel has made of the application of the agents of the insurrectionists for recognition of their pretended revolution. What you have reported

to us in this respect is happily confirmed in even more emphatic language by the communication which Mr. Mercier has made to us to-day under instructions from his government.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 43.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, September 14, 1861.

SIR :

In regard to the subject of the dispatch No. 72, dated the 24th of August, I have little to add to what has been said heretofore. The activity of the confederate emissaries has been of late very much stimulated by a feeling that the prospects of recognition will in a great degree depend upon their success in maintaining themselves through the next three months. To that end they are straining every nerve in the purchase of arms and ammunition, in fitting out vessels, in subsidizing men, and in affecting the channels of opinion in this country. The faithful co-operation of the agents of the United States at the various ports, in procuring information in advance of every movement, becomes more and more necessary.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 46.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, September 19, 1861.

SIR :

Passing from this subject to another collateral one, I have only to say that information has reached me from two different sources to the effect that not long since a direct application was made to the government here for a recognition of the insurgents on the ground of their success at Manassas, and that it was met with a decided negative. This will explain the reason of the positive language on that subject in Lord Russell's note to me in answer to the complaint made of the conduct of Mr. Bunch. I also learn that the measure, which at one time had been adopted by the cabinet, of sending out another detachment of troops to Canada, has been reconsidered, and laid aside for the present at least. Both these acts indicate a desire to avoid causes of irritation, which I do not doubt to prevail. The government will wait until the result of

the pending military preparations shall have scope for the fullest development.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 125.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 14, 1861.

SIR: Your dispatch of October 18th, No. 61, has been received.

I estimate very highly the information it contains and the estimates it furnishes of the comparative forces in Liverpool bearing on our conflict at home.

It is in France that the activity of our revolutionary emissaries just now is most signally displayed, and that the virtue of the government seems likely to be tried.

How strange that Great Britain and France do not at once see that they have only a lesser interest than our own in repressing this insurrection. Happily, the people of this country are rising every day to a more just consciousness of their own ability and their duty to put it forth. I grow more proud of my countrymen every day.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extracts.]

No. 136.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
Washington, November 30, 1861.

SIR: * * * * * *

We are impressed very favorably by Lord Palmerston's conversation with you. You spoke the simple fact when you told him that the life of this insurrection is sustained by its hopes of recognition in Great Britain and in France. It would perish in ninety days if those hopes should cease. I have never for a moment believed that such a recognition could take place without producing immediately a war between the United States and all the recognizing powers. I have not supposed it possible that the British government could fail to see this; and at the same time I have sincerely believed the British government must, in its inmost heart, be as averse from such a war as I know this government is.

I am sure that this government has carefully avoided giving any cause of offense or irritation to Great Britain. But it has seemed to me that the British government has been inattentive to the currents that seemed to be bringing the two countries into collision. I specify some of the incidents. The arms, munitions, and materials of war used by the insurgents come from Great Britain, and British merchants dispatch vessels with supplies for the insurgents to run the blockade; and though

the power of the British government to prevent these transactions is invoked, it is invoked in vain.

Secondly, the communication of the British and French governments to the insurgent cabal at Richmond, through Mr. Bunch, was a proceeding that could not fail to alarm the American government and people. When the fact happened to become known to us, I had just become satisfied, though in confidential communications, that the British government was prepared to assume a tone that should repel the prevailing presumption of its inclinations to a recognition. But the offensive correspondence of the British government left us no alternative but to exercise our right to revoke the exequatur of the offending consul. It was done, however, upon the grounds of his having rendered himself personally obnoxious.

Thirdly, when we asked the British government in all kindness to exclude piratical vessels which are preying upon our merchant marine, engaged in carrying bread to Europe, from British ports, we received for answer that the law officers of the Crown say that to supply such vessels with shelter, coal, and provisions does not conflict with her Majesty's proclamation, and thus these pirates are afforded by Great Britain privileges which are denied by every other civilized and Christian state.

I mention these things solely because I infer from Lord Palmerston's remarks that the British government is now awake to the importance of averting possible conflict, and disposed to confer and act with earnestness to that end. If so, we are disposed to meet them in the same spirit, as a nation chiefly of British lineage, sentiments, and sympathies—a civilized and humane nation—a Christian people.

Although this is a confidential note, I shall not object to your reading it to Earl Russell and Lord Palmerston, if you deem it expedient.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 157.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, January 2, 1862.

SIR: I herewith transmit for your information the copy of a confidential dispatch which I have this day addressed to the minister of the United States at Paris.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

[Extract.]

No. 97.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, January 2, 1862.

SIR: Your dispatch of the 11th December, No. 95, was received. Its principal topic is an article unfriendly to us, which appeared in a journal

at Paris, the Constitutionnel, with, as you are informed, the approval of the minister of the interior. For your vigilance in gathering this information and communicating it to us you have the sincere thanks of the President.

When treacherous pilots have run a ship upon a lee shore, she can be extracted from danger only by care and diligence in carrying her over successive breakers. We have already gotten our noble ship safely across more than one. The next will probably be a direct demonstration in Europe for recognition on account of the rigors of the blockade. If the military and naval movements now imminent shall be as successful as we think, we shall have much confidence in our ability to meet with success the last and greatest foreign difficulty before us. Keep us well advised of all indications on that subject.

You will have received a copy of the full correspondence concerning the Trent. I submit for your consideration whether it would not be well to call Mr. Thouvenel's attention to the suggestion made in my note to Mr. Mercier about the need of a revision of the maritime law. At the same time do not lose an opportunity for saying that, with our past and coming successes, we are quite sure that the need of the blockade will not continue very long. If necessary, speak of it as a thing daily more and more fully within our power to modify, if not terminate altogether.

I do not see how Great Britain is to come into the measure of breaking the blockade. If it were forcibly broken by her without excuse, would not the world have seen the last blockade? All these views are confidential. I wish you and Mr. Adams might find an opportunity to converse about them, and come to an understanding concerning the line of conduct to be suggested to us, in case of new difficulties when Parliament comes in.

* * * * *

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 168.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 23, 1862.

SIR: * * * * *

We hear continually of purposes entertained by portions of the British people to induce their government to lend itself to the aid of the insurrection. Our arguments against such an injurious proceeding have been already made known. We have, moreover, put ourselves upon the practice of justice and liberality towards the British nation and people in all our intercourse with them.

I do not know, therefore, that we can do more than wait for the threatened development, and meet it as we best can, if it must come. Happily, every day that passes finds us a people more united and determined in maintaining and preserving the integrity of the republic.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 106.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, January 24, 1862.

SIR: I am glad to perceive by the contents of the confidential note to Mr. Dayton, a copy of which accompanied your dispatch No. 157, of the 2d of this month, that the government is fully alive to a sense of the growing danger of European interference in American affairs. The indications of this disposition have become far more decided since the expectations formed from the case of the Trent have been disappointed. The first pretext seized on in France and eagerly caught up here has been the alleged destruction of the harbor of Charleston, and so impressible is the popular mind in both countries to any unfavorable representation of our action, that many of those really well disposed joined in the clamor, even before they were possessed of any of the facts. The next will be the inefficiency of the blockade, or else its excessive severity. And so it will go on until the public opinion shall be worked up to the proper pitch to sanction a positive interference. Already the Observer, one of the newspapers occasionally used as an organ of the minister, has distinctly alluded to the necessity of another Navarino, while another, the Globe, in a more subdued tone, hints with equal significance at the expediency of an armed intervention to put a stop to the war.

* * * * *

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 178.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 4, 1862.

SIR: * * * * *

Some correspondents and many journals write to us that the Parliament and the Chambers are to be pressed into discussions designed to induce Great Britain and France to recognize the insurgents and intervene to raise our blockade. I have already made some suggestions to you with a view to counteract those dangerous designs. I am not aware that I can now profitably do more in that direction.

* * * * *

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 112.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, February 7, 1862.

SIR: * * * * * *

I have the honor to transmit herewith a copy of her Majesty's speech to both houses of Parliament, together with the Morning Post newspaper of this morning, giving a report of the debate in the two houses yesterday on the address. It will be perceived that both Lord Russell and Lord Palmerston announced, quite distinctly, the intention of the government to maintain its present position. The position of Lord Derby, on the other hand, is somewhat equivocal, and would seem to imply an organized movement, if it were not for the finer tone of Mr. D'Israeli in the other house. On the whole, the expression of sentiment, so far as it goes, is favorable. The debate will, however, take quite a different shape when it comes to the questions presented in detail. There is no reason to doubt that a movement will then be made in whatever direction may be thought most likely, at the moment, to be favorable to the insurgents. The earnestness with which it will be pressed will largely depend on the nature of the intelligence received from the United States.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

HON. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 186.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 17, 1862.

SIR: The interval between the reception of your last dispatches and the departure of the mail is too short to permit full response to your call for information respecting details which would show the efficiency of the blockade. I send you a copy of a communication which has been received from the consul general at Havana, by which you will learn—

First. That in view of the extent of the coast blockaded, and the amount of commerce which existed before the blockade began, the number of vessels which have run the blockade is very small, and the trade effected by them is inconsiderable.

Second. That the success of the blockade has continually increased. It is now as nearly absolutely effective as any blockade ever was.

Third. That far the largest portion of the vessels which have run the blockade are British vessels.

You need not be told how little care the British government has taken to discourage or repress that prohibited trade.

But the true test is not the number of vessels that have entered or left the blockaded ports, but the actual effect of the blockade. I send you two articles on that subject, which you will find conclusive against all allegations that the blockade is inefficiently conducted.

Happily, the active campaign of our land and naval forces has begun.

The great preparations which have been made so diligently and so carefully in defiance of popular impatience at home and political impatience abroad are now followed by results indicative of a complete and even early decision of the contest in favor of the government.

We entertain too high an opinion of the justice as well as the wisdom of foreign states to apprehend any intervention in the face of these significant triumphs of the arms of the Union. As to details, the public journals which you will receive will be the best dispatches possible.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Shufeldt to Mr. Seward.

No. 3.]

UNITED STATES CONSULATE GENERAL,
Havana, January 14, 1862.

SIR: I inclose you a corrected list of the vessels which have run the blockade of the southern coast since its establishment, either to or from the ports of the island of Cuba.

I ask your attention to the fact that at the present moment the ports of the South are closed to commerce, except in the smallest class of vessels, and these, though nominally clearing from the more important seaports, really come from some of the many bayous and inlets in their vicinity.

It is also worthy of your notice that this trade is carried on almost exclusively under the British flag.

Brazos Santiago, Texas, seven miles from the mouth of the Rio Grande, by our latest accounts is not blockaded. It is possible that the government may have some object in leaving it open; but from the fact of its being open it is at present used unrestricted as a means of entering goods of every description into Texas. Vessels from this port (Havana,) laden with cargoes for the South, clear for Matamoras; but owing to the scarcity of water on the bar of the Rio Grande, (five feet,) they must of necessity, in this season of northers, discharge at Brazos, where they have eight feet of water on the bar.

The United States steamer Santiago de Cuba recently visited this point, as before reported to you, and found eleven schooners anchored at Brazos, all of which were engaged in contraband trade; and I have since seen in a New Orleans paper of 3d instant that this visit of the Santiago created great consternation, both ashore and afloat, as the paper stated it was almost without the means of defence.

Should it, therefore, be consistent with the views of the government, the closing of this port or its possession would go far toward the complete destruction of southern trade.

I am, sir, with respect,

R. W. SHUFELDT,
Consul General.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

List of vessels that have run the blockade.

HAVANA.

Date.	Nationality.	Class.	Name.	Cargo.	Port.
May 26	Spanish	Brig.	Juana Teresa	Lumber	Fernandina.
May 28	American	Schooner	Lovet	Ballast	Galveston.
June 6	British	do.	Emma de Ruase	Assorted	New Orleans.
June 8	Spanish	Bark	Teresta	do.	Do.
June 13	do.	do.	Jaruco	do.	Do.
June 16	British	Schooner	Tamauilpas	do.	Do.
June 20	do.	do.	Major Barbour	do.	Do.
June 28	Spanish	Bark	Juana Teresa	Lumber	St. Mary's.
Aug. 3	British	Schooner	Adeline	Rice	Savannah.
Aug. 8	do.	do.	Major Barbour	Cotton	New Orleans.
Aug. 11	do.	do.	Prince of Wales	Rice	Newbern.
Aug. 30	do.	do.	Robert Peel	do.	Do.
Sept. 9	do.	do.	S. H. Toome	Resin	New Orleans.
Sept. 15	do.	do.	Parliament	Rice	Savannah.
Sept. 26	do.	do.	Prince of Wales	do.	Beaufort.
Oct. 1	do.	do.	C. P. Knapp	Assorted	New Orleans.
Oct. 16	do.	Ketch	E. Burrows	Turpentine	Do.
Oct. 28	Confederate	Steamer	Theodora	Passengers	Charleston.
Oct. 28	British	Schooner	H. Travers	Turpentine	New Orleans.
Oct. 28	do.	do.	Major Barbour	Cotton	Do.
Oct. 30	do.	do.	Mabel	Rice	Charleston.
Nov. 4	do.	do.	Adeline	do.	Savannah.
Nov. 4	do.	do.	Parliament	do.	Do.
Nov. 8	Mexican	do.	Hermosa	Turpentine	New Orleans.
Nov. 10	British	do.	Sir Robert Peel	Rice	Savannah.
Nov. 11	do.	do.	Mary	do.	Do.
Nov. 13	do.	do.	Victoria	do.	Do.
Nov. 20	do.	do.	N. H. Northrop	do.	Wilmington.
Nov. 20	do.	do.	Lida	do.	Savannah.
Nov. 26	Confederate	do.	Break of Day	Turpentine	New Orleans.
Dec. 3	do.	Steamer	Vandervilt	Cotton	Do.
Dec. 5	do.	Schooner	W. Mallory	Turpentine	Mobile.
Dec. 11	do.	do.	Onward	do.	Appalachicola.
Dec. 21	do.	do.	New Year	do.	New Orleans.
Dec. 24	British	do.	Major Barbour	Cotton	Do.
Dec. 25	Confederate	do.	William Henry	Turpentine	Do.
Dec. 26	do.	do.	W. Benson	do.	Appalachicola.
Dec. 27	Mexican	do.	Zorro Colorado	Cargo	Brazos Santiago.
Dec. 31	Confederate	do.	R. Wilder	Turpentine	Mobile.

MATANZAS.

May 31	American	Brig.	H. Jackson	Rice	Savannah.
June 23	do.	Schooner	Velasco	Ballast	Galveston.
Aug. 12	British	do.	Algburth	Rice	Newbern.
Aug. 21	Confederate	Ketch	Noank	do.	Charleston.
Nov. 10	do.	Schooner	Tarper	do.	Do.
Nov. 10	British	do.	Anna	do.	Savannah.
Nov. 11	do.	do.	Havelock	do.	Charleston.

CARDENAS.

Oct. 28	Confederate	Steamer	Theodora	Passengers	Charleston.
Oct. 22	do.	Schooner	Waterman	Rice	Do.

List of vessels that sailed from Cuban ports and ran the blockade.

HAVANA.

Date.	Nationality.	Class.	Name.	Cargo.	Port.
May 26	British	Steamer	Miramón	Assorted	Mobile.
June 3	do.	do.	Victoria	Sugar	Georgia Coast.
June 8	do.	do.	Margaret Steph.	Cigars	Berwick Bay.
June 8	Spanish	Bark	Juana Teresa	Ballast	St. Mary's River.
June 28	British	Schooner	Major Barbour	Assorted	Barataria.
Aug. 8	do.	do.	Adeline	Coffee, &c.	Savannah.
Aug. 19	do.	do.	Prince of Wales	Coffee	Beaufort.
Aug. 20	do.	do.	Major Barbour	Assorted	Barataria.
Sept. 12	do.	do.	Sir Rob. Peel	Coffee	Savannah.
Sept. 19	do.	do.	Esilda	Assorted	do.

List of vessels that sailed from Cuban ports, &c.—Continued.

Date.	Nationality.	Class.	Name.	Cargo.	Port.
Sept. 24	British	Schooner	Parliament	Coffee	Savannah.
Sept. 26	do	do	J. H. Toome	do	do
Oct. 12	do	Steamer	Salvor	Coffee	do
Oct. 12	do	Schooner	Prince of Wales	do	Savannah.
Oct. 23	do	Ketch	R. Burrows	do	Mobile.
Oct. 26	do	Schooner	Jackson	Rum, sugars, &c.	do
Oct. 29	Confederate	Steamer	Theodora	Coffee	Fernandina.
Nov. 8	British	Schooner	Major Barbours	do	Barataria.
Nov. 9	do	do	Lord Lyons	Coffee	Brasos Santiago.
Nov. 9	do	do	Mabel	Fruit	do
Nov. 9	do	do	Adeline	Coffee	do
Nov. 12	do	do	Victoria	Assorted cargo	Brasos Santiago.
Nov. 12	do	do	H. Travers	do	Do.
Nov. 12	Mexican	do	Zorro Colorado	do	Do.
Nov. 23	British	Ketch	Lida	Coffee	Savannah.
Nov. 23	do	Schooner	Mary	do	Do.
Nov. 23	do	do	Victoria	do	Do.
Nov. 23	do	do	Sir Rob. Peel	do	Do.
Dec. 1	do	do	W. H. Northrop	do	Wilmington.
Dec. 9	do	do	Prince of Wales	do	Savannah.
Dec. 14	do	do	Hermosa	do	Do.
Dec. 22	do	do	Wide Awake	do	Mobile.
Dec. 24	do	Steamer	Black Joker	do	Barataria.
Dec. 24	do	Schooner	Sir Rob. Peel	Coffee	Savannah.
Dec. 24	Confederate	do	W. Mallory	Sundries	Mobile.
Dec. 27	British	Steamer	Labuan	European	Texas.
Dec. 31	do	Schooner	C. P. Knapp	Sundries	Mobile.
Dec. 31	do	do	Harriet	Coffee	Savannah.

MATANZAS.

June 4	British	Brig	H. Jackson	Molasses	Savannah.
June 4	do	Schooner	British Queen	do	Do.
July 6	do	do	Chief	do	Do.
July 6	do	Brig	Syren	do	Do.
Aug. 23	do	Schooner	Algbuth	Coffee	Charleston.
Aug. 30	do	Ketch	Noank	do	Do.

CARDENAS.

June 8	British	Schooner	Prince of Wales	Sugar	Savannah.
Aug. 1	do	do	Albion	Molasses	Charleston.
Aug. 13	do	do	Time	do	Savannah.
Nov. 1	do	do	Waterman	do	do

NOTE.—Since the above was put in type, one steamer and four schooners have arrived with cotton and naval stores at Havana and Matanzas from confederate ports.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 191.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, February 19, 1862.

SIR: Although I have adverted in other instructions to the subjects discussed in your dispatch of January 24, No. 106, it is only now that I have found leisure to acknowledge the reception of this paper. I am satisfied that the apprehension you expressed in it, of a probable intervention by Great Britain in our domestic contest, was well founded, as the circumstances of the case then appeared before the European world. But, happily, that aspect has changed, and the change must have now come over the disposition of even the most skeptical or the most hostile observers of our domestic contest throughout the world.

* * * * *

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 148.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,

London, April 25, 1862.

SIR: * * * * * I can only call your attention to the speech of Mr. Gladstone, at Manchester, which is reported in the Times of this morning. I am sorry to say that it is not in quite so friendly a tone as his former one on the same subject. Indeed, it seems to me that public opinion shows signs of fluctuation, just in proportion to the character of the news from America. The paragraph in the President's proclamation which relates to the removal of the dangers from foreign intervention is not well received, perhaps, because it touches the sore too abruptly. As the period approaches when the end of the existing stock of cotton grows more and more visible, the distress of the operatives appears more aggravated, and the speculations as to the future are more freely indulged in. The movements of the Emperor are watched with more interest, and hopes are undoubtedly cherished, in secret, that he will have the courage to do what many here wish, but are ashamed to declare to the world.

In the mean time outfits of vessels with supplies to run the blockade go on with increased vigor. Every account received of a successful voyage stimulates to enlarged contributions.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 1, 1863, p. 1.]

No. 1.

Lord Lyons to Earl Russell.

[Extract.]

WASHINGTON, *May 10, 1862.*

I have the honor to inclose copies of an article which has appeared in the National Intelligencer newspaper this morning, on the subject of rumors which have reached this country from Europe of an intention on the part of England and France to intervene in the present civil war. It is temperate in tone, and is deserving of attention, as it may be taken to express the view of the subject taken by this government.

Mr. Seward, indeed, spoke himself to me in very much the same language three days ago. The French government had, he said, all along very frankly communicated to the government of the United States its perplexities and the sufferings endured by its people in consequence of the interruption of commerce with the south. He had been unable for some time to do more than exhort that government to have patience and wait with confidence for the alleviation he had promised as the result of the first successes of the United States arms. He had now redeemed the promises he had made. Three ports were already opened;

it would soon be possible to open others. The United States were no longer responsible for the interruption of commerce. If trade should not revive, if foreign nations should still be unable to provide themselves with cotton, tobacco, and other southern products, the fault would lie, not with the United States but with the rebels. If the rebels destroyed the cotton and tobacco already in existence, if they gave up the cultivation of those articles, they would do so in opposition to the wishes and in defiance of the authority of the United States. The only course for foreign powers to take in order to relieve themselves from the sufferings which they already endured, and to secure themselves from the still greater sufferings which threatened them, would be to exert their influence in favor of the prompt restoration of the federal power in the insurgent States. Peace, the return of confidence, and the consequent resumption of trade and agriculture, would immediately follow the re-establishment of the Union and the Constitution. Mr. Seward added that he did not attach any belief to the rumors that England and France were in communication with a view to intervene in the affairs of this country. He had, indeed, received numerous letters from Europe stating it to be the fact; but he thought that the reports might be traced to the friendly representations to the United States which had been from time to time made by the French government; that perhaps that government was willing that such reports should be spread, in the hope that they might tend to make the French people patient.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 260.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 28, 1862.

SIR: Your dispatch of May 8 (No. 156) has been received.

There is a statement in the public journals that thirty vessels which had left British ports with a common design to run our blockade have gathered at Nassau, and that they are now remaining there, awaiting the relaxation of the blockade at some of the southern ports, which the President has permitted to take place on the 1st of June, preferring to avail themselves of that lawful privilege rather than persevere in their prohibited operations. I think, therefore, that we may congratulate ourselves upon having advanced to a new stage in our intercourse with maritime powers affecting the present troubles in the United States—a stage at which motives of sympathy in foreign countries with the insurgents, derived from the pressure of the blockade, will disappear.

This stage is also marked by another improvement of the case, namely, the withdrawal from the ocean of the pirates who have occasionally sought shelter and protection in friendly ports while committing depredations on American commerce.

Under the President's instructions I desire to improve the position thus attained to confer, if our representatives abroad shall think it discreet, with the friendly nations upon the prospects of the war and their future course in regard to it.

By way of introduction, I beg to recall to your recollection the facts that, at the earliest proper moment, I set forth most distinctly the opinions of this government that the mutual interest, present and permanent, of all the maritime nations, including this country, require the preservation of harmonious relations between them, and that the same interests

demand that, so far as possible, peace shall prevail throughout the world, and especially in the United States and upon the American continent.

In explanation of these views, I set forth the opinion that the industrial systems of Western Europe and the United States, including their agriculture, manufactures, and commerce, are, in some respects, to be regarded less as distinct national systems than as one general combination of agricultural, manufacturing, and commercial agencies, in which a jar in one country necessarily produces disturbance in all the others; so that a serious disorganization of the machinery employed in production here cannot fail to result in derangement, probably in disaster, everywhere abroad.

There are now some painful evidences that these speculations were not unsound. There is distress among the peasantry of Ireland, in the manufacturing towns of Belgium, and the wine presses and silk looms in some parts of France seem to be coming to a dead stand. All the sufferers—I will not stop to inquire how justly—trace their misfortunes to the civil war of the United States. It is manifest that what the European nations want is an end of that war as speedy, and leaving the industrial system of this country as little disorganized, as possible. It would seem impossible for any considerate person to doubt that this is the very consummation which the government of the United States must want, even more than it can be desired by the European states. This government has expressed that want earnestly, decidedly, sometimes, perhaps, even impatiently. Nevertheless, the war has continued a whole year, against the wishes of Europe as well as of America. A new campaign is even beginning. In order to determine whether it is likely to reach the desired end, it will not be unprofitable to consider the causes of its prolongation to the present period. This government, at the beginning, assumed, and it has constantly insisted, that the Union could, must, and should be preserved. On the other hand, the European nations, when they saw the storm burst upon the country, either doubted, or actually disbelieved, the possibility of that great salvation. Europe had but a subordinate and indirect interest in the great problem, and it supposed that if the United States could only be convinced that the Union could not, in the end, be preserved, they would at once forego the contest and consent to a national dissolution, which it was erroneously thought would be followed by peace, while we knew that it would only be the beginning of endless war. Thus European opinion has practically favored the insurgents and encouraged them with ephemeral sympathies and unreal expectations of foreign intervention, and has thus protracted the war to the present time.

Certainly this government and the American people are even more confident of the preservation of the Union now than they were a year ago, and are, therefore, even less likely now than they were then to accept peace with the inconceivable pains and perils of dissolution. Can it be presumptuous, then, for us to ask European statesmen to review, in the light of the events of the war, the opinion which they formed at so early a stage of it, that the opinion itself might, perhaps, properly be deemed a prejudice?

Of course, in such a review, the observer would not overlook the contrast between the position which the federal government held a year ago and its present situation. Then it had been practically expelled, with all its authorities, civil, military, and naval, from every State south of the Potomac, Ohio, and Missouri rivers, while it was held in close siege in this capital, cut off from communication with even the States which had remained loyal. Now, it has virtually retaken all the posi-

tions it so early lost on the seaboard; it possesses the Mississippi and all the other great natural highways, and has forced the insurgents to battle in the most inaccessible parts of the insurrectionary district. The forces and the resources of the government are unexhausted and increasing. Those of the insurgents are diminished and becoming nearly exhausted.

No one, either here or in Europe, now contests these simple facts. The only argument opposed to them is, that the insurgents have determined not to acknowledge the authority of the Union. The evidence of this is a certain resolute and defiant tone maintained by their organs.

Certainly so long as the insurgents have any hope of ultimate success, they could not be expected to discourse otherwise than in just such a tone, nor will they fail to cherish such a hope so long as they find a willingness to meet it with sympathy in Europe. The very last advices which came from that quarter, previous to the arrival there of the news of the fall of New Orleans and Norfolk, were full of speculations about some newly-conceived form of intervention.

But it must be remembered that the insurgents are men, and that they may reasonably be expected to speak and to act like other belligerent factions under similar conditions. So, also, being men, and subject to the laws which determine the economy of society, they must in all cases conform themselves, however unwillingly, to the circumstances by which they are surrounded. They cannot, more than other masses of men, determine for themselves, under one state of circumstances, what they will do under a different one. A writer upon war advises brave men never to nail their colors to the staff, remarking that if they shall be able, and find it desirable, they can maintain it there without nailing, while it will be more convenient to lower it if they shall find themselves unable or no longer desirous to keep it flying. But, speaking practically, what has been the result, thus far, in the present case? Has disloyalty been found an indomitable sentiment in this war? It pervaded even this capital and this District at the beginning of the strife. It no longer exists here. It divided Maryland, and provoked conflict there. The Union is now as strong in that State as in any one of the always loyal States. It committed Missouri to the pretended new confederacy. Missouri is now active and earnest among the loyal States. It placed Kentucky in an attitude of neutrality. But Kentucky is to-day firm, resolute and even self-devoted to the Union. In other regions where disloyalty was more general, such as Eastern Virginia, Tennessee, and Louisiana, and North Carolina, acquiescence under the federal authorities has promptly followed their appearance there, and the preliminary steps are taken for the restoration of the laws of the Union. It is a simple fact that loyalty reappears everywhere just so fast as the successes of the government are deemed sufficient to afford a guarantee for reliance upon its protection. The disunionists, even in their strongest holds, are not a people, but only a faction, surpassing the loyal in numbers, and silencing them by terrors and severities in many places, but nevertheless too few and feeble to prevent the return of any district or any State to the Union in the presence and under the protection of the federal authorities.

The President asks foreign nations to consider that we are only at the end of one year now, and yet the whole effective mass of the insurrectionary region has been brought into the field by conscription. The credit of the revolution is dead before the first dollar has been raised by taxation to support it, and the territory which must bear taxation is

at once reduced to the narrowest limits, and is exhausted of its wealth and supplies.

The power of a losing faction, under any circumstances, must continually grow less; but that of the disunionists is abating under the operation of a cause peculiar to themselves, which it is now my duty to bring forward—I mean the practice of African slavery.

I am aware that in regard to this point I am opening a subject which was early interdicted in this correspondence. The reason for this interdiction, and the reason for a departure from it, are, however, equally obvious. It was properly left out of view, so long as it might be reasonably hoped that by the practice of magnanimity this government might cover that weakness of the insurgents without encouraging them to persevere in their treasonable conspiracy against the Union. They have protracted the war a year, notwithstanding this forbearance of the government; and yet they persist in invoking foreign arms to end a domestic strife, while they have forced slavery into such prominence that it cannot be overlooked.

The region where the insurrection still remains flagrant embraces all or parts of several States, with a white population of four and a half million, and a negro population of three and a half million, chiefly slaves. It is thus seen to be a war between two parties of the white race, not only in the presence but in the very midst of the enslaved negro race. It is notorious, we could not conceal the fact if we would, that the dispute between them arose out of the questions in which the negro race have a deep and lasting interest, and that their sympathies, wishes, and interests naturally, necessarily, inevitably, fall on the side of the Union. Such a civil war between two parties of the white race in such a place, and under such circumstances, could not be expected to continue long before the negro race would begin to manifest some sensibility and some excitement. We have arrived at that stage already. Everywhere the American general receives his most useful and reliable information from the negro, who hails his coming as a harbinger of freedom. Wherever the national army advances into the insurrectionary region, African bondsmen, escaping from their insurrectionary masters, come out to meet it and to offer their service and labor in whatever capacity they may be desired. So many of these bondsmen have, even without the invitation, and often against the opposition of the federal military and naval authorities, made their way from bondage among the insurgents to freedom among the loyalists, that the government finds itself occupied with the consideration of measures to provide them with domicils at home or abroad. Not less than a hundred such escape every day, and as the army advances the number increases. If the war should continue indefinitely, every slave will become not only a free-man, but an absentee. If the insurgents should resist their escape, how could they hope to prevent the civil war they have inaugurated from degenerating into a servile war? True, a servile population, especially one so long enslaved as the Africans in the insurrectionary States, require time and trial before they can organize a servile war; but if the war continues indefinitely, a servile war is only a question of time. The problem, then, is whether the strife shall be left to go on to that point. The government, animated by a just regard for the general welfare, including that of the insurrectionary States, adopts a policy designed at once to save the Union and rescue society from that fearful catastrophe, while it consults the ultimate peaceful relief of the nation from slavery. It cannot be necessary to prove to any enlightened statesman that the labor of the African in the insurrectionary region is at present indis-

pensable, as a resource of the insurgents, for continuing the war, nor is it now necessary to show that this same labor is the basis of the whole industrial system existing in that region. The war is thus seen to be producing already a disorganization of the industrial system of the insurrectionary States, and tending to a subversion of even their social system. Let it next be considered that the European systems of industry are largely based upon the African slave labor of the insurrectionary States employed in the production of cotton, tobacco, and rice, and on the free labor of the other States employed in producing cereals, out of which combined productions arises the demand for European productions, materials, and fabrics. The disorganization of industry, which is already revealing itself in the insurrectionary States, cannot but impair their ability to prosecute the war, and at the same time result indirectly in greater distress in Europe.

On the other hand, this disorganization operates far less injuriously at present to the federal government and to the loyal States. Every African laborer who escapes from his service is not only lost to the support of the insurrection, but he brings an accession to the productive labor of the loyal States, and to that extent increases their ability to continue the contest in which they are reluctantly engaged. The failure of foreign importations, as heretofore, in return for the exportation of southern staples, stimulates the manufacturing industry of the loyal States. Immigration is accelerated by an activity in these States, resulting from extended manufacture and prosecution of the war. Thus has the phenomenon appeared, disappointing so many prophecies in Europe, that the war impoverishes and exhausts only the insurrection and not the Union. I shall not contend that these effects would be perpetual. I know there is a reckoning for every nation that has the misfortune to be involved in war, and I do not expect for the United States any exemption from that inexorable law. But it is enough for my present purpose that the penalties are neither more severe nor more imminent than the loyal States can endure while bringing this unhappy contest to its desired conclusion. Let us now suppose that any one or more European States should think it right or expedient to intervene by force to oblige the United States to accept a compromise of their sovereignty. What other effect could it produce than to render inevitable, and even hurry on, that servile war, so completely destructive of all European interests in this country, which this government so studiously strives to avoid? I know that the danger of any foreign nation attempting such a policy, if it has ever existed, has passed, as I am happy in knowing that no foreign government has ever threatened such intervention, while several magnanimous governments have repudiated all unfriendly designs. I have put forward that hypothesis only by way of preface to a question not less significant, namely, what must be the effect of such a policy abroad as will encourage the insurgents with hopes of an intervention which is never to occur? Is not that effect visible in the obstinacy of the insurgents in their destruction of the cotton and tobacco already cultivated and liable to be brought into commerce by the return of peace, and in their studied neglect of the planting the seed of their staples, and turning so much of the African labor as they are able to save into the production of supplies of provisions and forage, to enable them to continue the war? The effect will be further developed as time goes on in opening a way for that servile war which, if it shall be permitted to come, will produce infinite suffering throughout the world, and can only at last result in an entirely new system of trade and commerce between the United States and all foreign nations.

I need not say that these views are not grounded on any proceedings or expressions of the British government, and are to be submitted to them, only as they will be to other states, from a strong desire on the part of the President that the true condition of the present strife may be everywhere fully understood.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCOIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 160.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, June 12, 1862.

SIR: Your dispatch No. 160 is received.

The defeat of General Banks, to which it refers, has been commented upon by the great body of the English press as though it were a victory of vast importance to the southern cause. This, together with the check to our gunboats on the James River, is assumed as altering altogether the face of things; and the future of the war is now looked upon as a sort of dissolving view. The glass is reversed, and the end, they say, seems more remote than at the beginning. In this condition of things the rumors of recent conferences thicken, and it is said that a strenuous effort is now being made to induce England and France to intervene, in some form, in our affairs. Those who are hostile to the interests of the United States care little in what form this intervention comes. They believe that, should England and France tender mediation or otherwise, and the same be rejected by our government, (as they well know it would be,) these governments could not then stop; that the cotton interests, backed by the national pride of both countries, would urge them first into a recognition of southern independence, and then into an active intervention, if need be, to stop the war. It is seen, too, by those who are unfriendly to the Union of our States, that should success attend our arms in one or two more battles, it would be too late to tender aid to the South; that their condition would not even afford a fair pretext for interference. They do not mean the opportunity shall pass if they can prevent it. What success will attend their efforts I do not know.

* * * * *

I should not attach much importance to these rumors, however well accredited they seem to be, were it not for the exceeding pressure which exists for want of cotton, and the growing fear that the opening of ports merely will not supply that want.

Any hostile interference on the part of France would be much in conflict with the tone of feeling in which she has heretofore and at all times expressed herself. In addition, I do not see how she can suppose that her interference would tend to facilitate the procurement of cotton, which she so much needs. I can scarcely believe that anything *effective* will be attempted until the consequences of the opening of our ports have been realized. As yet no time has been given.

I get communications from our consuls in different quarters to know what is excluded from our opened ports under the head of "contraband of war." Mr. Chase's circular, as printed in certain New York papers, excludes "all liquors." This would embrace ordinary French and other

wines, the sole exports of Bordeaux and other towns. Can this have been the intention of the government?

I am, sir, your very obedient servant,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extracts.]

No. 176.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, June 20, 1862.

SIR: I had a conference with Lord Russell yesterday at four o'clock.

On the main object for which I had sought an interview, the reading to him your dispatch No. 260, I found, upon an examination of the various papers I had brought with me, that I had left it at home after all. But I gave the substance of it, and as his lordship intimated that he would like a copy of it, and I saw no objection to it, I agreed to send him one instead of putting him to the trouble of another conference.

This day the motion of Mr. Lindsay, affirming the desirableness of the recognition of the insurgents, is to be brought forward in the House of Commons. His lordship casually alluded to it in the course of our conversation as a matter of little importance. In point of fact, the character of our latest news would seem to render the agitation of the question almost ridiculous. A newspaper report of the result will doubtless go out in the steamer that carries this dispatch.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 287.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 5, 1862.

SIR: Your dispatch of June 20 (No. 176) has been received.

It is a satisfaction to know that a copy of my dispatch No. 260 has been received and read by Earl Russell. The subject it presents is one of momentous import. It seems as if the extreme advocates of African slavery and its most vehement opponents were acting in concert to precipitate a servile war—the former by making the most desperate attempts to overthrow the federal Union, the latter by demanding an edict of universal emancipation as a lawful and necessary, if not, as they say, the only legitimate way of saving the Union.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 168.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, July 9, 1862.

SIR: * * * * *

The constant advance in the market price of that article [cotton] in the United States tends to induce the belief here that our own people, even, have no confidence in the early suppression of the rebellion. The proffer of mediation, it is said, will be the opening, and will be followed up by such course of action as circumstances may render necessary. Our friends here are, therefore, again in excitement as to the future policy of the Emperor. These alarms in Paris and London are, as you know, periodical. Although I sometimes report them to your department, I have not myself been much moved by them heretofore, nor am I now. A proper respect for this government seems to require that we abide its policy as indicated through its official agents. In looking over the ground, I cannot see how any policy hostile to us can be adopted which would not be injurious to France and irreconcilable with the uniform professions of this government made from the beginning. If any change is to be inaugurated, fair dealing would seem to require that it be announced to us in advance. I cannot, however, shut my eyes to one fact, and that is, that those French journals which are looked upon as representing the views of this government have, within the last few weeks, changed their tone and spirit in connection with the affairs of our country. A number of them are now almost as unjust and unfair in their representations as the London Times itself. This, you may rely upon it, would not be if such course were not, for some reason, agreeable to the French government, or to the leading officials of the government. The European press, and more especially the French press, is not irresponsible like our own, and its movements, or the movements of portions of it, are under the constant direction of the ministry of the interior.

* * * * *

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

[Extract.]

No. 178.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 10, 1863.

SIR: * * * * *

The increased activity of European politicians directed towards effecting some intervention in our affairs, which you have described, has not passed unobserved here. It is to be regretted, because it produces unprofitable resentments among our people, and embarrasses the action of all the governments concerned. The excuses which it employs abroad are not entertained here, because they are unjust in principle, and without ground in fact. If we happen to fail in one of several combined

military enterprises, as every belligerent power, subject to the chances of war, must occasionally fail, it is pronounced abroad to be conclusive against the success of the whole war. If, on the other hand, we gain victory upon victory, with a rapidity and upon a scale such as only the campaigns of the first Emperor of France exhibited, the refusal of the insurgents to render instant and universal submission to the federal authority renders these successes in foreign eyes ineffectual and valueless.

There can be no harm in asking foreign governments and statesmen, under these circumstances, to consider our position, our interests, our purposes, and our character, as well as their own.

We are rightfully here, a nation lawfully existing, widely extended, and firmly established, with peculiarly beneficent institutions, upon a continent separate and remote from that occupied by the nations whose interference with us is so vehemently and perseveringly urged. In maintaining our own integrity, we are defending the interests and the the cause not merely of popular government, but of the very institution of civil government itself. We have no hostile or interested designs against any other state or nation whatever, and, on the contrary, we seek peace, harmony, and commerce with them all, and consequently, in desiring to remain undisturbed by them, we are defending the peace of the world.

Our policy in this emergency is a prudent, honest, direct, and generous one. We have raised large armies and a considerable navy. The reduction of Vicksburg, the possession of Chattanooga, and the capture of Richmond, would close the civil war with complete success. All these three enterprises are going forward. The two former will, we think, be effected within the next ten days. For the third we require re-enforcements, which are being rapidly and lavishly contributed at our call. The three hundred thousand additional troops will be in the field in sixty days, and within about the same period we shall have afloat as large an iron-clad fleet as any in the world. The war is becoming one of exhaustion to the insurgents, and they, not we, are hastening forward the rise of a servile population in arms on the side of the government. Under these circumstances, although we deprecate foreign interference, we deprecate it hardly less for the sake of other nations than for our own, and we deprecate it upon considerations of prudence and humanity, and not at all from motives of fear or apprehension.

Having always contemplated the possibility of such interference, we shall be found not unprepared for it, if it must come. We have so conducted our affairs as to deprive it of all pretense of right or of provocation. We have interfered with the dominion or the ambitious designs of no nation. We have seen San Domingo absorbed by Spain, and been content with a protest. We have seen Great Britain strengthen her government in Canada, and have approved it. We have seen France make war against Mexico, and have not allied ourselves with that republic. We have heard and redressed every injury of which any foreign state has complained, and we have relaxed a blockade in favor of foreign commerce that we might rightfully have maintained with inflexibility. We have only complained because an attitude of neutrality encouraging to rebellion among us, adopted hastily and unnecessarily, has not been relinquished when the progress of the war showed that it was as injurious as it was ill-advised.

Under these circumstances, if intervention in any form shall come, it will find us in the right of the controversy and in the strong attitude of self-defense. Once begun, we know how it must proceed. It will here

bring out reserved and yet latent forces of resistance that can never go to rest until America shall be reconquered and reorganized by Europe, or shall have become isolated forever equally from the industrial and governmental systems of that continent. European statesmen, I am sure, before waging war against us, will consider their rights, interests, and resources, as well as our own. For ourselves, we do not believe that European domination is to be rebuilt here upon the foundation of African slavery.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 185.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,

London, July 11, 1862.

SIR: *

I learned yesterday, from a credible source, that it is the intention of some of the ministers this evening to take new ground on the subject of America, should Mr. Lindsay decide to press his motion. Should such prove to be the case, I shall forward a report of the debate to-morrow, by mail, via Queenstown.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 186.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,

London, July 17, 1862.

SIR: *

I think last week I wrote to you mentioning the rumor that some demonstration might be made in Parliament on Friday night, and promising to send you a report of it should it take place. So slight seemed the promise of success at that instant that it turned out that Mr. Lindsay, the father of the original proposition upon which debate was to take place, had neglected to put it on the paper, and hence there was no subject to discuss. To remedy this defect, Lord Vane Tempest gave notice of a new motion, which contemplated nothing less than direct intervention in our quarrel by peaceable means *or otherwise*. Although this gentleman is the son-in-law of the Duke of Newcastle, his position in the House of Commons is not such as to give rise to much anxiety for his demonstration. Such was the state of things on Saturday and Sunday. But the later news of the present week has very considerably changed it.

Yesterday Mr. Lindsay took courage, and announced the resumption of his purpose. He first modified his motion so as to embrace both the

points of recognition and intervention, incorporating into it even the significant word "*otherwise*," borrowed from that of Lord Tempest. To-day I learn that he has seen the effect of that course, and has so changed his language as to embrace only the idea of *mediation* in conjunction with other powers, and that of pledging Parliament to sustain the ministry in any policy they might think proper to pursue. I do not quote the phraseology, because it may yet undergo alterations, and you will be sure to see it in its final shape, as it will come up for discussion to-morrow night. It is now understood that Mr. Lindsay proposes to press his question to a division, and it is thought that a sufficient number of members favor it to sustain the intention. I do not think it is countenanced by the ministry or by the more influential members of the opposition. But it is a good deal nursed by the rank and file of the latter, and by a portion of the ministerialists. With these explanations you will be able to form your judgment of the prospect before us. For the rest I shall take measures to be well informed of the precise temper of the House through some person present at the debate, and shall endeavor to send you a report of it by the steamer of Saturday.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 2, 1863, p. 8.]

No. 5.

Mr. Mason to Earl Russell.

54 DEVONSHIRE STREET, PORTLAND PLACE,
London, July 17, 1862.

MY LORD: In late proceedings of Parliament, and in reply to inquiries made in each house, as to the intention of her Majesty's government to tender offices of mediation to the contending powers in North America, it was replied, in substance, by Lord Palmerston and your lordship, that her Majesty's government had no such intention at present; because, although this government would be ever ready to offer such mediation, whenever it might be considered that such interposition would be of avail, it was believed by the government that, in the present inflamed or irritated temper of the belligerents, any such offer might be misinterpreted, and might have an effect contrary to what was intended.

I will not undertake, of course, to express any opinion of the correctness of this view so far as it may apply to the government or people of the United States; but as the terms would seem to have been applied equally to the government or people of the Confederate States of America, I feel warranted in the declaration that while it is the unalterable purpose of that government and people to maintain the independence they have achieved, while under no circumstances or contingencies will they ever again come under a common government with those now constituting the United States; and although they do not in any form invite such interposition, yet they can see nothing in their position which could make either offensive or irritating a tender of such offices on the part of her Majesty's government, as might lead to a termination of the

war—a war hopelessly carried on against them, and which is attended by a wanton waste of human life at which humanity shudders. On the contrary, I can entertain no doubt that such offer would be received by the government of the Confederate States of America with that high consideration and respect due to the benign purpose in which it would have its origin.

I have, &c.,

J. M. MASON.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, July 19, 1862.

SIR: * * * * * *

Although it is no longer disguised that the main object the nation has in view is the final disruption of the Union, but a comparatively small number are yet ready for the task of effecting it by force. Such a sentiment is openly expressed in private by men without responsibility, but it has not yet crept into the ranks of those who aspire to the direction of affairs.

The speech of Lord Palmerston is reported to me as having been decisive. You will of course scan it with the scrutiny which its importance deserves. I think you will not fail to detect in it the leading idea, as well as the means secretly relied upon to carry it into ultimate execution. I do not regard war as the policy of the premier. Things are altogether in too ticklish a condition here to make a resort to such an expedient advisable, especially when the same end may be attained by less hazardous means. In this sense it may not be without its use to observe the policy of the London Times, as explained by its leaders of the last week. I have reason to know that the whole course of that paper is directed to one end, and that is a division of America. The expectation in that quarter is that the joint action of all the powers of Europe may be finally enlisted in a course marked out by Great Britain. Should this fail, then it may be undertaken in conjunction with and under the apparent lead of France. In any event, the final result is believed to be certain. It may be hastened by the success of the rebels, but it is regarded only as a question of time.

It is proper to say that the members of the opposition were perceived during the debate to be acting in constant consultation with Mr. Mason and several of his associates, who had been introduced by them on the floor. I do not find that they have much connection with the other side.

On the whole, I come to the conclusion that everything depends here upon the military results in America. Very serious reverses will be likely to bring on a recognition at an early moment.

* * * * * *
I am, sir, your most obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 2, 1863, p. 9.]

No. 6.

Earl Russell to Mr. Mason.

FOREIGN OFFICE, July 24, 1862.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 17th instant, respecting the intention expressed by her Majesty's government to refrain from any present offer of mediation between the contending parties in North America, and I have to state to you, in reply, that, in the opinion of her Majesty's government, any proposal to the United States to recognize the southern confederacy would irritate the United States, and any proposal to the Confederate States to return to the Union would irritate the confederates.

This was the meaning of my declarations in Parliament upon the subject.

I am, &c.,

RUSSELL.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 2, 1863, p. 9.]

No. 7.

Mr. Mason to Earl Russell.

54 DEVONSHIRE STREET, PORTLAND PLACE,
London, July 24, 1862.

MY LORD: In the interview I had the honor to have with your lordship in February last, I laid before your lordship, under instructions from the government of the Confederate States, the views entertained by that government, leading to the belief that it was, of right, entitled to be recognized as a separate and independent power, and to be received as an equal in the great family of nations.

I then represented to your lordship that the dissolution of the Union of the States of North America, by the withdrawal therefrom of certain of the confederates, was not to be considered as a revolution, in the ordinary acceptation of that term; far less was it to be considered as an act of insurrection or rebellion; that it was, both in form and in fact, but the termination of a confederacy which, during a long course of years, had violated the terms of the federal compact by the exercise of unwarranted powers, oppressive and degrading to the minority section. That the seceding parties had so withdrawn as organized political communities, and had formed a new confederacy, comprising then, as now, thirteen separate and sovereign States, embracing an area of 870,610 square miles, and with a population of 12,000,000. This new confederacy has now been in complete and successful operation as a government for a period of nearly eighteen months; has proved itself capable of successful defense against every attempt to subdue or destroy it; and in a war conducted by its late confederates, on a scale to tax their utmost power, has presented everywhere a united people, determined at every cost to maintain the independence they had affirmed.

Since that interview more than five months have elapsed, and during that period events have but the more fully confirmed the views I then

had the honor to present to your lordship. The resources, strength, and power in the Confederate States developed by those events, I think, authorize me to assume, as the judgment of the intelligence of all Europe, that the separation of the States of North America is final; that under no possible circumstances can the late federal Union be restored; that the new confederacy has evinced both the capacity and the determination to maintain its independence, and, therefore, with other powers the question of recognizing that independence is simply a question of time.

The Confederate States ask no aid from, nor intervention by, foreign powers. They are entirely content that the strict neutrality which has been proclaimed between the belligerents shall be adhered to, however unequally it may operate, because of fortuitous circumstances, upon them.

But if the principles and the morals of the public law be, when a nation has established before the world both its capacity and its ability to maintain the government it has ordained, that a duty devolves on other nations to recognize such fact, then I submit that the government of the Confederate States of America, having sustained itself, unimpaired, through trials greater than most nations have been called to endure, and far greater than any it has yet to meet, has furnished to the world sufficient proof of stability, strength, and resources to entitle it to a place among the independent nations of the earth.

I have, &c.,

J. M. MASON.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 2, 1863, p. 10.]

No. 8.

Mr. Mason to Earl Russell.

54 DEVONSHIRE STREET, PORTLAND PLACE,
July 24, 1862.

Mr. Mason presents his compliments to Earl Russell, and, if agreeable to his lordship, Mr. Mason would be obliged if Earl Russell would allow him the honor of an interview, at such time as may be convenient to his lordship.

Mr. Mason desires to submit to Earl Russell some views connected with the subject of the letter he has the honor to transmit herewith, which he thinks may be better imparted in a brief conversation.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 2, 1863, p. 10.]

No. 9.

Earl Russell to Mr. Mason.

FOREIGN OFFICE, July 31, 1862.

Lord Russell presents his compliments to Mr. Mason. He begs to assure Mr. Mason that it is from no want of respect to him that Lord Russell has delayed sending an answer to his letter of the 24th instant.

Lord Russell has postponed sending that answer in order that he

might submit a draft of it [to] the cabinet on Saturday next. It will be forwarded on Monday to Mr. Mason.

Lord Russell does not think any advantage would arise from the personal interview which Mr. Mason proposes, and must therefore decline it.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 197.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, July 31, 1862.

SIR: * * * * * * *

The constant cry is that the Emperor of France will interfere. The wish is so much the father to the thought that it is difficult to make people believe this ministry is not interposing much too stubbornly against the execution of his desire. If I am to credit the rumors that I hear from sources claiming to be of high authority, the Emperor has sent for Mr. Slidell and announced that he is ready to recognize the rebel States without the concurrence of England. But for the sake of courtesy he desires him to direct Mr. Mason to make a new application to the ministers, so as finally to test the determination here. These are stories which I trace pretty directly to the confederate emissaries themselves, who sedulously agitate this alternation of rumors between the two countries to serve their ends. Of the degree of credit to which they are entitled, you are in a position better qualified to judge than I. My object is simply to warn you of the prevailing temper which certainly desires interposition of some kind, and which, therefore, cannot be regarded as entirely prognosticating calmness and peace. Hence it must be remembered that however favorable the ministry here may now be to the maintenance of their declared policy, they are not in a condition to stand long in resistance to any popular outcry prompted by the concentrated passions of an agitated community. The experience of the case of the Trent is of too recent occurrence to make it necessary to seek further for an illustration of what I mean.

* * * * * * *

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 2, 1863, p. 10.]

No. 10.

Mr. Mason to Earl Russell.

54 DEVONSHIRE STREET, PORTLAND PLACE,
August 1, 1862.

MY LORD: In the interview I had the honor to propose in my late note I had intended briefly to submit the following views, which I thought might not be without weight in the consideration to be given by her Majesty's government to the request for recognition of the Con-

federate States, submitted in my letter of the 24th July, ultimo. I ask leave now to present them as supplemental to that letter.

If it be true, as there assumed, that in the settled judgment of England the separation of the States is final, then the failure of so great a power to recognize the fact in a formal manner imparts an opposite belief, and must operate as an incentive to the United States to protract the contest.

In a war such as that pending in America, where a party in possession of the government is striving to subdue those who, for reasons sufficient to themselves, have withdrawn from it, the contest will be carried on in the heat of blood and of popular excitement long after its object has become hopeless in the eyes of disinterested parties.

The government itself may feel that its power is inadequate to bring back the reculant States, and yet be unable at once to control the fierce elements which surround it, while the war rages. Such it is confidently believed is the actual condition of affairs in America.

It is impossible in the experience of eighteen months of no ordinary trial, in the small results attained, and in the manifest exhaustion of its resources, that any hope remains with the government of the United States, either of bringing about a restoration of the dissevered Union, or of subjugating those who have renounced it. And yet the failure of foreign powers formally to recognize this actual condition of things disables those in authority from conceding that fact at home.

Again, it is known that there is a large and increasing sentiment in the United States in accordance with these views, a sentiment which has its origin in the hard teachings of the war as it has progressed.

It was believed (or so confidently affirmed) that there was a large party in the southern States devoted to the Union, whose presence and power would be manifested there as soon as the public force of the United States was present to sustain it. I need not say how fully the experience of the war has dispelled this delusion.

Again, it was believed, and confidently relied on, that in the social structure of the southern States there was a large population of the dominant race indifferent, if not hostile, to the basis on which that social structure rests, in which they were not interested, and who would be found the allies of those whose mission was supposed to be in some way to break it up; but the same experience has shown that the whole population of the south is united, as one people, in arms to resist the invader.

Nothing remains, then, on which to rest any hope of conquest but a reliance on the superior numbers and the supposed greater resources of the northern States. I think the results of the last (or pending) campaign has proved how idle such expectations were, against the advantages of a people fighting at home, and bringing into a common stock of resistance, as a free-will offering, all that they possessed, whether of blood or treasure. A spectacle now historically before the world.

It is in human experience that there must be those in the United States who cannot shut their eyes to such facts, and yet, in the despotic power now assumed there by the government, to give expression to any doubt would be to court the hospitalities of the dungeon.

One word from the government of her Majesty would encourage those people to speak, and the civilized world would respond to the truths they would utter, "that for whatever purpose the war was begun, it was continued now only in a vindictive and unreasoning spirit, shocking alike to humanity and civilization." That potent word would simply be to announce a fact, which a frenzied mind could only dispute, that the

southern States, now in a separate confederacy, had established before the world its competency to maintain the government of its adoption, and its determination to abide by it.

To withhold it would not only seem in derogation of truth, but would be to encourage the continuation of a war, hopeless in its object, ruinous alike to the parties engaged in it, and to the prosperity and welfare of Europe.

J. M. MASON.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extracts.]

No. 314.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, August 2, 1862.

SIR: * * * * *

It is indeed manifest in the tone of the speeches, as well as in the general tenor of popular discussions, that neither the responsible ministers, nor the House of Commons, nor the active portion of the people of Great Britain sympathize with this government, and hope, or even wish for its success in suppressing the insurrection; and that, on the contrary, the whole British nation, speaking practically, desire and expect the dismemberment of the republic. I cannot deny that these sentiments must insensibly influence the administration, and give its policy a hostile direction. But these sentiments are, after all, in a great measure, speculations; and they may very well exist, and yet the government, and certainly the people of Great Britain, may be entirely unprepared by any responsible action to attempt to precipitate a change here whose consequences may be momentous, even to themselves. I well recollect that, with what seemed to us far better motives, Great Britain recently wished and expected the separation of Hungary and of Venice from Austria; and yet the government passively looked on, and saw the revolutions designed to effect those ends languish and perish. It is a proverb that the earth is full of good but unexecuted intentions. Happily for human society, the proportion of evil intentions unfulfilled is equally great. Indeed, we can hardly be surprised at the disposition and the tendencies upon which I am dwelling, unless we shall persist, after so much opposing evidence, in our early error of conceding to Great Britain a degree of magnanimity which she herself does not even affect to claim, and which, perhaps, has never yet been exhibited by any nation: We cannot forget that we are a younger branch of the British family; that we have not been especially reverential of the senior branch, and have even been ambitious to surpass it in wealth, power, and influence among the nations. To these facts it is to be added that, in the very heat of competition, we have broken, have abandoned the course, and have divided ourselves into suicidal factions. The success of the insurgents would make it sure that the race could never be resumed, while the triumph of the government would probably reanimate the national ambition once more. At this moment we have encountered an unexpected reverse, which encourages our eager enemies, wherever they may be, to hope for our signal and complete overthrow. Did ever any nation, at once so presumptuous, yet so unwise, and so apparently unfortunate, secure the absolute forbearance of a rival it had boldly challenged? Certainly not, and therefore I reckon not upon any sentimental forbearance of the British government. The American people understand, as

well as their government does, that none is to be expected or even desired. Still the disfavor of Great Britain is inherently illiberal; and happily the unwarrantable and too unreserved exhibition of it naturally rouses the American people to a sense of their danger, and tends to recall them from unworthy domestic strife to the necessity of regaining the national prestige they have so unwisely lost. Allowing now British prejudice and passion their full effect, the government of Great Britain must, nevertheless, be expected to act with a due regard to the safety, honor, and welfare of the British empire. Great Britain is at peace with the whole United States, and practically with the whole world. Manufactures and commerce do, indeed, suffer derangement and abatement in consequence of our civil war. This war, however, like every other, must come to an end in some way, and at some not distant time, if she continue to stand aloof; and when that end shall have come, whatever its nature may be, she will enjoy, at least, all the benefits that she could in any event obtain by intervention to compel a peace. Is it probable that her intervention would mitigate the war, or alleviate the embarrassment she is suffering from it? The question seems to involve a preliminary one, namely: what is to be the character of her intervention? Is it to be merely a moral one, or an act of recognition, with a declaration of neutrality, but not respecting our blockade, and not refraining and restraining her subjects from violating it? Shall we not, in that case, be justified in withdrawing the relaxation of the blockade we have already made, and in closing the ports we have opened to her commerce? If we should do this, would her recognition of the insurgents shorten the war, or would it alleviate the embarrassment she suffers from it? But it may be answered that she would not consent to surrender these concessions, and would resort to force to save them. Then Great Britain would violate belligerent rights allowed us by the law of nations, and would become an ally of our domestic enemies; and then she would be at war with us while, at least, some other commercial state would be maintaining towards us relations of neutrality and peace. Would Great Britain profit by a war with us? Certainly neither nation could profit by the war while it should be in actual operation. But it is said she might divide and conquer us. What would she gain by that? Would the whole or any part of the United States accept her sovereignty and submit to her authority? The United States, under their present organization and constitution, must always be a peaceful nation, practically friendly to Great Britain, as well as to all foreign states, and so they must always be conservative of the peace of nations. Let this organization be struck down by any foreign combinations, what guarantee could Great Britain then have of influence or favor, or even commercial advantage to be derived from this country? Even if this nation, after having lost its liberties and its independence, should remain practically passive, who is to restrain the ambitious of European states for influence and dominion on this side of the Atlantic; and how long, under the agitation of such ambitions, could Europe expect to remain in peace with itself? But what warrant have the British government for expecting to conquer the United States, and to subjugate and desolate them, or to dictate to them terms of peace. A war urged against us by Great Britain could not fail to reunite our people. Every sacrifice that their independence could require would be cheerfully and instantly made, and every force and every resource which has hitherto been held in reserve in a civil war, because the necessity for immediately using it has not been felt, would be brought into requisition. I shall not willingly believe that Great Britain deliberately desires such a war, as I am sure

that every honorable and generous effort will be made by the United States to avoid it.

In the second place, I observe that apprehensions of a change of attitude by Great Britain are built in some degree upon the supposed probability that very serious reverses to the national cause may occur. None such, however, have yet occurred. We cannot and do not pretend to reckon upon the chances of a single battle or a single campaign. Such chances are, perhaps, happily beyond human control and even human foresight. But the general course of the war and its ultimate results are subjects of calculation, on a survey of forces and circumstances with the aid of experience. We cheerfully leave the study of the probabilities of this war, in this way, to all statesmen and governments whom it may concern, declaring for ourselves that while we apprehend no immediate danger to the present military condition, the most serious reverses which can happen will not produce one moment's hesitation on the part of the government or the people of the United States in the purpose of maintaining the Union, or sensibly shake their confidence in a triumphant conclusion of the war.

* * * * *

I shall not here add to the explanation which I have made on other occasions of our means and resources for meeting a final trial of the national strength and the national virtue. Rather than do this, I willingly turn away from the spectacle of servile war and war abroad—of military devastation on land, and of a carnival of public and private cupidity on the seas, which has been presented to me—to set down with calmness some reflections calculated to avert an issue so unnecessary and so fatal, which you may possibly find suitable occasion for suggesting to the rulers of Great Britain. For what was this great continent, brought up, as it were, from the depths of what before had been known as “the dark and stormy ocean?” Did the European states which found and occupied it, almost without effort, then understand its real destiny and purposes? Have they ever yet fully understood and accepted them? Has anything but disappointment upon disappointment, and disaster upon disaster, resulted from their misapprehensions? After near four hundred years of such disappointments and disasters, is the way of Providence in regard to America still so mysterious that it cannot be understood and confessed? Columbus, it was said, had given a new world to the kingdoms of Castile and Leon. What has become of the sovereignty of Spain in America? Richelieu occupied and fortified a large portion of the continent, extending from the Gulf of Mexico to the Straits of Belleisle. Does France yet retain that important appendage to the Crown of her sovereign? Great Britain acquired a dominion here surpassing, by an hundred fold in length and breadth, the native realm. Has not a large portion of it been already formally resigned? To whom have these vast dominions with those founded by the Portuguese, the Dutch, and the Swedes, been resigned but to American nations, the growth of European colonists, and exiles who have come hither bringing with them the arts, the civilization, and the virtues of Europe? Has not the change been beneficial to society on this continent? Has it not been more beneficial even to Europe itself than continued European domination, if it had been possible, could have been? The American nations which have grown up here are free and self-governing. They have made themselves so from inherent vigor and in obedience to an absolute necessity. Is it possible for European states to plunge them again into a colonial state and hold them there? Would it be desirable for them and for Europe, if it were possible? The balance

of power among the nations of Europe is maintained not without numerous strong armies and frequent conflicts, while the sphere of political ambition there is bounded by the ocean which surrounds that continent. Would it be possible to maintain it at all if this vast continent, with all its populations, their resources, and their forces, should once again be brought within that sphere? If we, who rightfully dwell on this continent, with all the inducements to peace, harmony, and good order which so fortunate a position creates, cannot remain at peace among ourselves, even when free from foreign interference, does Europe expect that we will be reduced and kept in the harmony which her interests require when the jealousies and ambitions of all Europe are engrafted upon the stock of our native dissensions? Again: Spain undertook to plant and establish here a system of Indian slavery, with what success I need not answer. Portugal, Spain, and Great Britain, with more labor, wealth, and consummate skill, undertook to establish African slavery. It has perished from the whole continent except Brazil and the United States. Now, when the social system of the United States is convulsed with the agony of slavery here, is it desirable that slavery should be revived and perpetuated, and the republic perish for refusing it unbounded expansion and duration? Is it wise for Europe to attempt to rescue slavery? Is it possible, if the attempt shall be made? On the contrary of all these suppositions, is it not manifest that these American nations were called into existence to be the home of freemen; that the states of Europe have been trusted by Providence with their tutelage, but that tutelage and all its responsibilities and powers are necessarily withdrawn to the relief and benefit of the parties and of mankind when these parties become able to choose their own system of government and to make and administer their own laws? If they err in this choice, or in the conduct of their affairs, it will be found wise to leave them, like all other states, the privilege and responsibility of detecting and correcting the error by which they are, of course, the principal sufferers.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 178.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,

Paris, August 2, 1862.

SIR: I learn unofficially that the Count ——— states as a fact that France, England, and Russia have agreed to recommend to the United States the cessation of hostilities, and the settlement of their controversy with the South. In other words, they are to offer mediation, not together, but separately. That this comes directly from ———, I have no doubt; but there are so many stories afloat, of this or like nature, coming from him, that I cannot give it full credence; more especially as it would seem to conflict with my general information from other quarters. Still, I report the statements to you.

* * * * *

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 2, 1863, p. 11.]

No. 11.

Earl Russell to Mr. Mason.

FOREIGN OFFICE, August 2, 1862.

SIR: I have had the honor to receive your letters of the 24th of July and 1st instant, in which you repeat the considerations which, in the opinion of the government of the so-called Confederate States, entitle that government to be recognized of right as a separate and independent power, and to be received as an equal in the great family of nations.

In again urging those views you represent, as before, that the withdrawal of certain of the confederates from the Union of the States of North America is not to be considered as a revolution, in the ordinary acceptance of that term, far less an act of insurrection or rebellion, but as the termination of a confederacy which had, during a long course of years, violated the terms of the federal compact.

I beg leave to say in the outset that upon this question of a right of withdrawal, as upon that of the previous conduct of the United States, her Majesty's government have never presumed to form a judgment. The interpretation of the Constitution of the United States, and the character of the proceedings of the President and Congress of the United States under that Constitution, must be determined, in the opinion of her Majesty's government, by the States and people in North America, who inherited, and have till recently upheld, that Constitution.

Her Majesty's government decline altogether the responsibility of assuming to be judges in such a controversy.

You state that the confederacy has a population of twelve millions; that it has proved itself for eighteen months capable of successful defense against every attempt to subdue or destroy it; that in the judgment of the intelligence of all Europe the separation is final; and that under no possible circumstances can the late federal Union be restored.

On the other hand, the Secretary of State of the United States has affirmed, in an official dispatch, that a large portion of the once disaffected population has been restored to the Union, and now evinces its loyalty and firm adherence to the government; that the white population now in insurrection is under five millions, and that the southern confederacy owes its main strength to hope of assistance from Europe.

In the face of the fluctuating events of the war, the alternations of victory and defeat, the capture of New Orleans, the advance of the federals to Corinth, to Memphis, and the banks of the Mississippi as far as Vicksburg, contrasted, on the other hand, with the failure of the attack on Charleston, and the retreat from before Richmond, placed, too, between allegations so contradictory on the part of the contending powers, her Majesty's government are still determined to wait.

In order to be entitled to a place among the independent nations of the earth, a state ought to have not only strength and resources for a time, but afford promise of stability and permanence. Should the Confederate States of America win that place among nations, it might be right for other nations justly to acknowledge an independence achieved by victory and maintained by a successful resistance to all attempts to overthrow it. That time, however, has not, in the judgment of her Majesty's government, yet arrived.

Her Majesty's government, therefore, can only hope that a peaceful termination of the present bloody and destructive contest may not be distant.

I am, &c.,

RUSSELL.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 322.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, August 13, 1862.

SIR: Your dispatch of July 31 (No. 197) has been received.

I remark, with reference to the reports circulated by American traitors in London that the Emperor of the French proposes to recognize the insurgents without waiting for any new combinations, that there is nothing to confirm these reports in any communication, official or unofficial, which has been received by us from Paris. We learn from that capital that there, as in England, sentiments unfavorable to our cause and our country seem to be gaining more general favor under the inculcations of a hostile press.

In all his communications with this government the Emperor of the French has preserved a tone that was frank, friendly, and respectful, letting us understand, however, that a strong pressure upon the government was made by classes which attributed their sufferings to a deficiency of a supply of cotton. The statement by disunionists that the Emperor has directed Mr. Slidell to instruct Mr. Mason to make another formal appeal to Earl Russell preliminary to his own separate and exclusive action seems improbable. Could the cupidity of British merchants resist the temptation to keep peace with us if France should go to war alone? Could France propose to go to war with us without Great Britain as an ally? Is France more ready for hazards of war than Great Britain?

While we are making ourselves ready, as far as possible, for whatever emergency may happen in our foreign relations, and while we sensibly feel that the present apparent condition of suspended activity in our military operations tends to encourage hostile machinations abroad, we nevertheless rely with much confidence on other circumstances for a continuance of peace and forbearance.

First. All the world knows that we shall not entertain any foreign mediation in our domestic affairs; this decision was made known at an early period, and if we have not repeated it with emphasis, it has been because such repetitions would seem disrespectful to foreign powers, and would be inconsistent with the proper dignity of this government.

Secondly. We are supplying Europe with grain and gold, and even cotton, to the best of our ability, and no one can safely predict that equal supplies could be obtained here or elsewhere if the maritime powers should wage or provoke a war with this government.

Thirdly. Our preparations for continuing the war are vigorous and successful. On the 15th of this month we shall have enlisted and coming into the field three hundred thousand new volunteers for the war, and within forty days thereafter this force will be followed by three hundred thousand militia, who will be organized as volunteers and will be not less effective.

The construction of iron-clad ships is going on, on a scale and with a

vigor that promises as complete a naval defense as any other nation possesses.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 1, 1863, p. 16.]

No. 20.

Mr. Stuart to Earl Russell.

WASHINGTON, August 16, 1862.

MY LORD: I thought that the best way of acting upon your lordship's dispatch of the 28th ultimo* would be to read it to Mr. Seward, which I accordingly did during my interview with him this morning.

He listened attentively, but made no observations, merely asking me when I had finished whether I should like him to show it to the President.

I declined this offer, as it seemed rather made from politeness than from an idea that the dispatch would produce any effect upon the President's mind, and as your lordship had not even instructed me to read it to Mr. Seward, I did not feel authorized to leave it with him.

I have, &c.,

W. STUART.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Circular.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, August 18, 1862.

SIR: Ideas of appeal, mediation, and intervention seem to hold their place in the European mind, although their novelty has long since worn off. Our representatives abroad, therefore, under the apprehension that some form of interference may be attempted or adopted, frequently and urgently ask for information concerning the purposes of this government.

No foreign state has at any time communicated or intimated to us, in any way, a design, or even a disposition, to take a new attitude in regard to our domestic affairs. Generally the communications which we have received have been marked with directness and frankness. It would, therefore, imply an unbecoming and even unreal distrust on our part to assume that any hostile intentions are indulged by the maritime powers of Europe.

On the other hand, this government can at no time forget that foreign intervention is the inevitable result of long-continued domestic strife; nor can we forget that the existing attitude of all those powers was assumed without their having given us any previous notice; that it is anomalous, and, although unintentionally so, it is nevertheless practically

* Printed with No. 206 of Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward, dated August 22, 1862, *post*.

unfriendly and injurious. The government, moreover, cannot affect to be ignorant that disloyal citizens of the United States are abroad, and that parties and masses are agitating Europe to induce or oblige its governments to intervene. Besides these circumstances, it must be remembered that the prosecution of civil war is attended by accidents which beget misapprehensions and excite passions and prejudices in foreign states. It is therefore our duty to act as if we supposed that some of the maritime powers, although they are not indeed waiting upon occasion, may yet, upon some unexpected vicissitude, be found directly or indirectly allied and co-operating with our internal enemies.

I think that the instructions which have issued from this department have not left our representatives any room to doubt that it is the determination of the government to defend the integrity of the country and maintain the Union, under all circumstances and against all who in any case may assail them. I think, moreover, that the magnitude and the character of our land and naval preparations indicate the same determination, which is the result, not of variable impulses, but of fixed convictions and unchangeable principles.

Formal declarations of a policy, clearly enough revealed without them, are unnecessary and generally injudicious, because they provoke needless and often embarrassing criticism and debate.

Our representatives abroad are nevertheless entitled to understand, and sometimes it may be profitable for them to know, the grounds upon which a fixed and important policy is pursued.

While the nation is convulsed with a civil strife of unexampled proportions, it would be presumptuous, perilous, and criminal to court or provoke foreign wars. Reviewing the whole course of the existing administration, I may safely claim that it shows that, even if the government had been left at liberty to conduct its foreign affairs, altogether irrespectively of the civil war, it would yet have chosen and maintained a policy of peace, harmony, and friendship towards all nations. It is certainly our especial care, under existing circumstances, to do no injustice, to give no offense, and to offer and receive explanations in a liberal spirit whenever they are possible, and thus to make sure that if, at any time, either accidentally or through the intrigues of the insurgents, we shall incur the misfortune of collision with foreign states, our position will then be one of pure and reproachless self-defense.

The nation has a right, and it is its duty, to live. Those who favor and give aid to the insurrection, upon whatever pretext, assail the nation in an hour of danger, and therefore they cannot be held or regarded as its friends. In taking this ground the United States claim only what they concede to all other nations. No state can be really independent in any other position.

Willing, however, to avert difficulties by conciliatory explanations, we frankly confess to the conviction that either the insurrection must be subdued and suppressed or the nation must perish. The case admits of no composition. If we have no fear of failure, it is because we know that no other government than this could stand in this country, and that permanent dismemberment of it is impossible. The principal masses of the population are content with the present system, and cannot be brought to oppose or to surrender it. The faction which is attempting to destroy it, although infatuated and energetic, is, relatively to the whole people, an inconsiderable one. The natural highways of the country, extended sounds and lakes, and long, widely branching rivers, combined with its artificial roads, are bonds which can neither be removed nor permanently broken by any mere political force whatsoever. The so-called Gulf States

need the free use of all these highways, and those who dwell upon their borders will not consent to be shut out from the ocean. The wealth and patronage of the whole nation are needful to perfect civilization on the Pacific coast, and the Atlantic States must forever derive protection and support from the recesses of the continent. Those who are attempting to break up the Union must either substitute new commercial and social connections for the highways now existing, or they must invent and establish a new political system which will preserve them. Nature opposes the former project. The wit of man fails to suggest not merely a better political system, having the same objects as the present Union, but even any possible substitute for it.

If it be said that these arguments are disposed of by the fact that civil war has occurred in defiance of them, I answer that the civil war is not yet ended. If it be replied that at least there is a manifest danger of dissolution of the Union, I rejoin that the occurrence of the civil war at most proves only that in this country, as in every other, it is possible for faction to interrupt the course of civil administration and to substitute anarchy for law. I do not know that any wise man has ever doubted that possibility. Sedition is, as I suppose, a vice inherent and latent in every political state. But the condition of anarchy is not only anomalous but necessarily a transient one. I do not pretend to say how long the deplorable disturbances now existing here may continue, nor what extreme the anarchy which prevails in the southern part of the country may reach. It may be that the storm may continue one or more years longer, and that there may be a dissolution of society in that unhappy region. But after such a convulsion every state requires repose and again seeks peace, safety, and freedom; and it will have them, if possible, under the political system which is best adapted to those ends. Alexander, Cæsar, and Napoleon, each in his time cast down established states and substituted new ones in their places. Yet the hand that made the violent change had hardly been withdrawn when the subverted states reappeared, standing more firmly than before on their ancient foundations.

It is freely admitted that the salvation of the Union depends on the will and the choice of the American people, and that they are now engaged in a fierce conflict upon that very question. But sooner or later there must come a truce, because civil war cannot be indefinitely endured. Will there then be reconciliation? It cannot happen otherwise. When such a time arrives, any society will prefer the attainable to the unattainable object, the greater to the lesser advantage, and will bury every domestic difference to save itself from the worst of all political evils—foreign conquest and domination. The object of the insurgents is the fortifying and extending of African slavery. Is the object, under existing circumstances, really attainable? Is it not becoming more manifestly impossible every day that the war is prolonged? Is even the continuance of slavery itself worth the sacrifices which the war has brought? It is assumed that the insurgents, however erroneously, are determined upon that point. I reply, that it is always a class, or a sect, or a party, and not the whole country, that provokes or makes civil war, but it is not the same class or sect or party, but the whole country, that ultimately makes the peace; and hence it has happened that hardly one out of a hundred attempted revolutions has ever been successful. Is not this the instruction of the civil wars of England, France, and San Domingo?

The consideration that this is a republican state has been heretofore impressed upon the correspondence of this department, and it cannot be too steadily kept in view by our representatives in Europe. Precisely

because it is both a federal and a republican state, with its cohesion resulting from the choice of the people in two distinct processes, the nation must cease to exist when a foreign authority is admitted to any control over its counsels. It must continue to be jealous of foreign interventions and alliances, as it always heretofore has been.

The nation, moreover, is an American one. It has maintained pleasant and even profitable intercourse with the states of the eastern continent; but it nevertheless is situated in a hemisphere where interests and customs and habits widely differing from those of Europe prevail. Among these differences this one at least is manifest: we neither have sought, nor can we ever wisely seek, conquests, colonies, or allies in the Old World. We have no voice in the congresses of Europe, and we cannot allow them a representation in our popular assemblies. All of the American States once were dependencies of European powers. The fact that it is necessary to discuss the subject of this letter sufficiently proves that even if those powers have relinquished all expectation of recovering a sway here that was so long ago cast off, yet the American nations have nevertheless not realized their safety against European ambition. For this reason, also, we must be left by foreign nations alone, to settle our own controversies and regulate our own affairs in our own American way.

If the forbearance we claim is not our right, those who seek to prevent our enjoyment of it can show the grounds upon which foreign intervention or mediation is justified.

Will they claim that European powers are so much more enlightened, more just, and more humane than we are, that they can regulate not only their own affairs but ours also, more wisely, and more beneficially than we have done? How and where have they proved this superiority?

I cannot avoid thinking that the ideas of intervention and mediation have their source in an imperfect conception in Europe of the independence of the American nation. Although actual foreign authority has so long passed away, yet the memory of it, and the sentiment of dictation, still linger in the parental European states. Perhaps some of the American nations have, by their willingness to accept of favors, lent some sanction to the pretension. But certainly this will not be urged against the United States.

We have too many proofs that our independence is by no means pleasing to portions of European society. They would, however, find it difficult to justify their dislike. That independence was lawfully won, and it has been universally acknowledged.

Is our peculiar form of government an offense? It was chosen by ourselves and for our own benefit, and it has not been enforced by us, nor can it in any case be enforced, upon any other people. Our own experience has proved its felicitous adaptation to our condition, and the judgment of mankind has pronounced that its influences upon other nations are beneficent. The severest censure has found no defect in it, except that it is too good to endure.

What plea for intervention or mediation remains? Only this, that our civil war is inconvenient to foreign states. But the inconvenience they suffer is only incidental, and must be brief; while their intervention or mediation might be fatal to the United States. Are not all civil wars necessarily inconvenient to foreign nations? Must every state, when it has the misfortune to fall into civil war, forego its independence and compromise its sovereignty because the war affects its foreign commerce? Would not the practice upon that principle result in the dissolution of all political society?

But it is urged that the war is protracted. What if it were so? Do our national rights depend on the time that an insurrection may maintain itself? It has been a war of fifteen months. The battle-field is as large as Europe. The dynamical question involved is as important as any that was ever committed to the issue of civil war. The principles at issue are as grave as any that ever were intrusted to the arbitration of arms. The resources opened by the government, the expenditures incurred, the armies brought into the field, and the vigor and diligence with which they are maneuvered, have never been surpassed; nor has greater success, having due regard to the circumstances of the case, ever been attained.

Notwithstanding these facts, Europeans tell us that the task of subduing the insurrection is too great, that the conclusion is already foregone, and the Union must be lost. They fail, however, to satisfy us of either their right or their ability to advise upon it, while they no longer affect to conceal the prejudices or the interests which disqualify them for any judgment in the case.

Finally, the advocates of intervention are shocked by the calamities we are enduring, and concerned by the debts we are incurring, yet they have not one word of remonstrance or discouragement for the insurgents, and are busy agents in supplying them with materials of war. We deplore the sufferings which the war has brought, and are ready and anxious to end the contest. We offer the simple terms of restoration to the Union, and oblivion of the crimes committed against it, so soon as may be compatible with the public safety.

I have expressed these views of the President to our representatives at this time, when I think there is no immediate danger of foreign intervention, or attempt at mediation, to the end that they may have their due weight whenever, in any chances of the war, apprehensions of foreign interference may recur.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 208.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, August 22, 1862.

SIR: * * * * * * *

You will have seen before this the publication made by Lord Russell of your dispatch No. 260, a copy of which I communicated to him so long ago as the 19th of June last, and also of his own note to Mr. Stuart, of the 28th of July, taking notice of it. The whole proceeding must be admitted to be not a little anomalous. His lordship received a copy of the paper from me, which was furnished only for his information and for that of his government. He holds it for more than a month without even acknowledging its existence, when all of a sudden, on intimation of the probability of a call for information in the House of Lords, he seizes the occasion not to write to me, but to address a species of reply to Mr. Stuart, at Washington, based upon the intelligence received of some reverses in America, which seem then, for the first time, to be caught at as a justification for continuing in the old line of policy, and

then causes both to be published forthwith. This singular proceeding has subjected his lordship to some sharpness of criticism even here.

I have indeed been told, but not by authority such as to place the matter altogether beyond a doubt, that your dispatch, in connection with preceding ones likewise communicated, and other considerations, had had so much effect on the ministry as to incline them to leave open a way to the reversal of their former policy, depending on the issue of the movement upon Richmond. Had that been successful, the recognition of belligerent rights was to have been withdrawn. I do not vouch for this as true, but, at any rate, it would fully explain the cause, both of the earlier delay and of the later action.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 12, 1862, p. 4.]

No. 2.

Earl Russell to Mr. Stuart.

FOREIGN OFFICE, July 28, 1862.

SIR: I have left hitherto unanswered and unnoticed a dispatch of Mr. Seward's, which Mr. Adams delivered to me more than a month ago.

I have done so partly because the military events referred to in it were, in the opinion of her Majesty's government, far from being decisive, and partly because there was no proposal in it upon which her Majesty's government were called upon to come to any conclusion.

Events subsequent to the date of Mr. Seward's letter have shown that her Majesty's government in their opinion upon the first of these points were not mistaken. Victories have been gained, reverses have followed; positions have been reached in the near neighborhood of the capital of the confederates, and these positions have been again abandoned. These events have been accompanied by great loss of life in battle and in hospital, while such measures as the confiscation bill, passed through both houses of Congress, and the proclamations of General Butler at New Orleans bear evidence of the increasing bitterness of the strife. The approach of a servile war, so much insisted upon by Mr. Seward in his dispatch, only forewarns us that another element of destruction may be added to the slaughter, loss of property, and waste of industry, which already afflict a country so lately prosperous and tranquil.

Nor on the other point to which I have adverted have I anything new to say.

From the moment when the intelligence first reached this country, that nine States and several millions of inhabitants of the great American Union had seceded and had made war on the government of the President, down to the present time, her Majesty's government have pursued a friendly, an open, and a consistent course. They have been neutral between the two parties to a civil war. Neither the loss of the raw material of manufacture, so necessary to a great portion of our people, nor the insults constantly heaped upon the British name in speeches and newspapers, nor the rigor, beyond the usual practice of nations, with which the Queen's subjects, attempting to break the loose blockade of

the southern ports, have been treated, have induced her Majesty's government to swerve an inch from an impartial neutrality.

At this moment they have nothing more at heart than to see that consummation of which the President speaks in his answer to the governors of eighteen States, namely, the bringing of this unnecessary and injurious civil war to a speedy and satisfactory conclusion.

As to the course of opinion in this country, the President is aware that perfect freedom of comment upon all public events is in this country the invariable practice, sanctioned by law, and approved by the universal sense of the nation.

I am, &c.,

RUSSELL.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 211.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, August 29, 1862.

SIR: * * * * *

The idea of intervention seems rather to lose than gain strength with the progress of events. And, although the spirit in England cannot be said to be in any degree changed, it seems rather to waste itself in abstract lamentation on the existence of a remote evil, than to gather force for any particular mode of dealing with it.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

No. 189.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, September 3, 1862.

SIR: Your dispatch to me No. 192, and your confidential dispatch to Mr. Adams, No. 322, of which you send me a copy, treat so far as France is concerned, of the same matter, to wit: the probabilities of the Emperor interfering in the affairs of our country. I have taken occasion to inform you heretofore that I feel myself justified in relying upon the friendly feeling of this country until I shall have some official intimation to the contrary. It is true that at a court where there is a power—a thinking, acting power—*behind* the minister with whom one communicates, we can never feel quite sure of our position; yet I cannot permit myself to be disturbed by the alternation of rumors referred to in the extract from Mr. Adams's confidential dispatch No. 197. I listen to all such reports with the utmost distrust. Paris is full of emissaries, or rather emigrants, (if I may call them so,) male and female, from the South; most of them have come to Europe or remain in Europe to avoid the danger of a residence at home. But while careful to absent themselves, they apparently think of nothing else, and speak of nothing else, but the war, and the certain success of the South. They mix in society, and pick up every rumor afloat on its surface, magnify it, reproduce it, and finally, them-

selves, I have the charity to suppose, believe it. Even Mr. Slidell, as early as last winter, gave to a gentleman in Paris of the highest character, the most distinct assurance, founded, as he said, upon certain knowledge, that the South would be recognized in sixty or ninety days, and advised him to make his business arrangements accordingly; yet at that period, notwithstanding the *talk* in a certain official coterie, there was not even a chance of recognition. The very fact that these rumors of intended interference upon the part of the Emperor are afloat should make us distrust their truth; the Emperor does not do things in that way; he does not take counsel of the world before he acts. His very reticence and the reticence of Mr. Thouvenel, in the midst of these newspaper statements, have sometimes made me uneasy, and I have therefore wished to know what was said by Mr. Mercier at Washington. But there has been at no time, in my judgment, just ground for believing, as reported to you, "that the Emperor has directed Mr. Slidell to instruct Mr. Mason to make another formal appeal to Earl Russell preliminary to his own separate and exclusive action." The very form of the proposition is to my mind evidence of its falsity.

You say (in dispatch No. 192) there has not been a week since the war commenced that somebody has not conveyed to you statements implying hostile designs upon the part of the Emperor; this I can well understand. Our citizens, and sometimes even officials, transiently in Paris, who should know better, pick up these rumors, become excited, hurry first to the legation, then write to the department. It is a singular fact that every American citizen abroad thinks himself entitled to know everything that has ever passed between our government and the Emperor, and are very much dissatisfied unless I at once make a clean breast of it. No reliance at all is to be placed upon reports transmitted to you from such quarters; if right at all, they are so by accident.

Nothing has occurred here of any official character, not already reported, to justify the belief that the Emperor intends to interfere with us.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

[Extract.]

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 336.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, September 8, 1862.

SIR: I have to acknowledge the receipt of your dispatch of August 22, No. 208.

Mr. Stuart read to me, in due time, the note which Earl Russell had addressed to him on the 28th day of July, commenting upon the dispatch No. 200, which I wrote to you so long ago as the 28th day of May last, and which you so properly and promptly put into his hands on the 20th of June last. But Mr. Stuart seemed not to have been instructed to leave a copy with me, and for obvious reasons I did not solicit one.

His lordship's proceedings in leaving the paper submitted to him unnoticed until all expectation of special attention to it was given up, and in then taking it up, under a supposed change of affairs in this country,

and making it the basis of instruction to Mr. Stuart here, in vindication of the British government, instead of giving an answer through you to the appeal contained in the paper, was indeed extraordinary. It did not, however, seem necessary for any national interest of ours to take special notice of these proceedings. They were at the time attributed by this government to some new political domestic pressure upon the ministry of Great Britain, and I am happy to learn that, according to the best information which we have been able to obtain, such was the case. I shall add only, that however necessary Earl Russell's course in the matter may have been in regard to British interests at home, and however beneficial it may have been to them, it has not made a favorable impression in this country, or produced a conviction here of the friendly feelings and dispositions towards us on the part of Great Britain, which his lordship has so generously, and doubtless with entire sincerity, avowed.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 338.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, September 9, 1862.

SIR: I inclose for your information a copy of my dispatch No. 207, of yesterday, addressed to Mr. Dayton.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

[Extract.]

No. 207.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, September 8, 1862.

SIR: I send you a copy of a dispatch which I have this day addressed to Mr. Adams. It will give you all the information concerning the military situation which it is thought expedient to communicate. More details might, indeed, have been furnished, but such operations are now in progress that changes must occur, the intelligence of which will anticipate the slow course of an official correspondence.

The special purpose of this dispatch is to give for your information a very peculiar, and possibly significant, conversation which I had the honor of holding last evening with Mr. Mercier, the French minister plenipotentiary near this government. I must first, however, make a short preliminary statement.

This government, as you are aware, has always believed that the maintenance here of the sovereignty constituted by the federal Union is important to the political interests of France. This government believes, also, that the dynastic interest of the present Emperor cannot be per-

manently separated from the present political interests of that country. The government of the United States has persisted, therefore, in regarding the imperial government as really friendly to the United States, while there has been no disposition to press, or even ask for those manifestations of this friendship which it might be inconvenient for the French government to make in view of the present circumstances of France at home, or its contentions with, or relations to, other powers. This government has for these reasons, as well as on the ground of its high appreciation of the wisdom of the Emperor of France, disbelieved the thousand rumors it has heard of designs and purposes on his part to embarrass the United States in their exertion to suppress this domestic insurrection. This government, moreover, has had occasion to observe and acknowledge that Mr. Thouvenel has seemed frank, liberal, and just in all his proceedings towards this country.

Mr. Mercier is understood by us to enjoy the confidence of Mr. Thouvenel. He is also regarded by us as being governed by high sentiments of honor and fidelity in the discharge of his mission. We were aware, indeed, that his acquaintance, and perhaps his social relations, with some of the leaders of the insurrection before the war began, had caused him to be impressed, more strongly than others of the diplomatic corps here, with a belief not probably of the justice of their cause, but of their strength and resolution. Without distinctly knowing the fact, I have believed that he has constantly desponded of the success of this government in preserving the Union. I am aware that in this statement I have only cast into connection with each other, facts of which I have fully informed you on different occasions heretofore.

Mr. Mercier left Washington for a sojourn in the North, I think, before the battles were fought at Richmond. Down to that time I had his voluntary assurance that he had received no communication from his government bearing on the subject of recognition or intervention, then, and always, so much discussed.

He came to this city to converse with me last week, while I was absent for a very few days. Yesterday he called again. Just previous to his coming I had heard informally, and unofficially, that he had in his dispatch of last week written to Mr. Thouvenel that the time for recognition by France had, in Mr. Mercier's opinion, arrived. I do not know how true this statement may have been.

Mr. Mercier in his interview with me said that he had come back to Washington in consequence of the recent events. He asked, first, whether it is true that this government is dissatisfied with Mr. Dayton, and proposes to recall or supersede him. Secondly, whether it is not less true that this government is satisfied with the fairness, candor, and spirit of Mr. Thouvenel in regard to our affairs. I replied that there is not a shadow of foundation for allegations that this government is dissatisfied with Mr. Dayton. No sentiment of that kind has ever been expressed or entertained by the President myself, or any member of the cabinet. As to Mr. Thouvenel, I spoke with equal confidence the President's favorable convictions and my own, and assured Mr. Mercier that Mr. Thouvenel's conduct of affairs in relation to this country had won for him the highest respect and confidence on the part of this government. Mr. Mercier expressed himself highly gratified with these explanations upon both points, and assured me that the manner in which you performed your duties is very acceptable to Mr. Thouvenel, and that he would hear with great regret of any change which should relieve you from your mission.

These preliminaries thus settled, Mr. Mercier said that Mr. Thouvenel

has always written to him, "We will do nothing at any time, or in any way, until you (Mr. Mercier) shall tell us it is for the best interests of the whole country." I will now tell you what is our opinion, the opinion of our government, exactly and fairly. He proceeded: "I think now that the Union is no longer possible. We, therefore, think, my government thinks that what is best is that which will be nearest to what has been before, what is most like to what the Union has been. So that, if there must be two confederacies, then that they should be confederated confederacies." Here Mr. Mercier stopped, and I took up the word, saying: "Mr. Mercier, you can do this country and your own no greater service than by telling your government at once that this government neither has the thought, nor can entertain it, by whomsoever it may be suggested, that there are, or can ever be, two confederacies here, or any other government than this Union, just as it constitutionally exists, and has always been." He interposed to say that I must confess that circumstances must control; and that they now look very unfavorable. I replied that our government saw nothing in the change of circumstances but a new phase in the ever-changing panorama of war, which would probably be followed by a new and different phase to-morrow. He said, "You are expecting a battle soon." I replied "Yes, we expect a battle and a victory; but, however this may be, do not for a moment believe that either the President, Congress, myself, or any person connected with this government, will in any case entertain any proposition or suggestion of arrangement, accommodation or adjustment from within or without, upon the basis of a surrender of the federal Union. He again replied, "Certainly, but you know we are friendly; and we are looking to the possibilities of your disappointment, and you would then think it necessary to adopt the best practicable measures for the preservation of the country and its welfare." I replied, "I must undeceive you entirely in that respect. Chaos, even if it must result from our efforts to save the Union, could not be worse than the best substitute that could be offered or found for it, if it were to be overthrown; and chaos it must be, if indeed there were no alternative but attempts at composition of the strife, either on the offer of the insurgents, or through the intervention of any foreign powers whatever their wishes might be. You know what France did to save her integrity in 1793. Do not for a moment let France believe that the people of the United States will do or suffer less to save themselves from the evils of social dissolution." I said, "We shall prosecute this war to its end. We do not doubt our strength. We have actually in and coming into the field at least seven hundred thousand men, and we are perfecting a navy which I believe for efficiency and defense will be equal to any other in the world. Our resources are as fully equal to the exactions upon them as the resources of any power that may assail will be to sustain the assault. So far, then, from entertaining any idea of division of the country, or of new arrangements, we shall maintain it against all who shall oppose us." I remarked, "This is strong language, but it is the duty of this government to protect the public interests, and vigor of speech as well as of action is required in emergencies." He said, "Yes, but we have an interest also in the matter which must be looked to." I replied, "Certainly, but the sovereignty of a state is an interest which, in its own councils, must be held paramount in its importance to any incidental or foreign question."

He then asked me if you had written me something about Garibaldi, and affairs in Italy. I replied that you had not written a word. "Have you heard something from Mexico?" I replied, "Not a word." These questions gave me an opportunity to say: "Your government can see with

what moderation and prudence we are conducting our affairs. We think France has trouble enough in Mexico, and she is likely to have some trouble in Italy. But we have drawn back our hands and sealed our lips in regard to those concerns. We forbear at all points, with all parties, on all sides. We have redressed every complaint that any foreign nation has presented that was capable of being redressed, and we are ready to refer to impartial convention any that we are unable to redress by our own exclusive authority. We mean if we come into collision with any foreign power to have not only the right on our side, but the position of self-defense. Reverting to the topic with which the conversation began, I spoke again of Mr. Thouvenel hoping that he might remain where he is, and of your declining; that, so far as I knew the President's pleasure, you could remain where you are so long as circumstances should permit us to be represented at Paris.

The conversation was very earnest and friendly, and all in the same vein.

Mr. Mercier, however, gave me no further explanation of the grounds of his conviction, or the authority upon which he spoke, and I did not think it expedient to ask him how much of what he said was of his own suggestion, or how much was said under instruction.

It would seem to me very strange if the French government should think of intervention or recognition under existing circumstances. If our case were hopeless, as Mr. Mercier supposes, there would in that case very soon be an end of the strife without any foreign intervention. If it is not hopeless, intervention can never make it so.

I do not think it will be expedient for you to read this dispatch to Mr. Thouvenel. But you will, if you think proper, speak of it to him, ascertaining what report has been made upon the subject. The occasion can hardly pass without Mr. Thouvenel's speaking with frankness and directness concerning the purposes and policy of the French government, if they have one; and in that case you will have an opportunity, as if without special directions, to explain the real attitude and the real views and sentiments of the government of the United States.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 229.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,

London, October 3, 1862.

SIR: Since the date of my last I have received dispatches from the department numbered from 339 to 349, both inclusive.

The telegraph intelligence so far outstrips the ordinary course of communication that the accounts of the result of the invasion of Maryland and Pennsylvania followed close upon the mention in your No. 349 of General McClellan's first success. As yet we are not in possession of the details, but the effect upon the popular mind of what is known has been already very considerable. So strong had the impression become that all power of further resistance by the government was for the moment destroyed, that many people confidently counted upon the

possession of the national capital by the rebels as an event actually past. The surprise at this manifestation of promptness and vigor has been quite in proportion. The great stroke which was to finish the war, that had been early announced here as about to take place in September, seems to have failed, and to have left its projectors in a worse condition than ever. The prevalent notion of the superiority of military energy and skill on the part of the insurgents in the field has been weakened. As a consequence, less and less appears to be thought of mediation or intervention. All efforts to stir up popular discontent meet with little response. The newspapers of the day contain a report of a decided check just given to a movement of this kind at Staley Bridge, near Manchester. On the whole, I am inclined to believe that perhaps a majority of the poorer classes rather sympathize with us in our struggle, and it is only the aristocracy and the commercial body that are adverse. Perhaps it may be quite as well for us if this should be the case. For the present ministry sufficiently reflects the popular side to be in little danger of precipitation so long as no impulse from that quarter shall be manifested against us.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

No. 234.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, October 8, 1862.

SIR: I have read with respect and earnestness the notes of a conversation between Mr. Thouvenel and yourself, which you have sent to me.

Mr. Thouvenel's cordial and friendly dispositions and his candor are appreciated by the President, and by this whole government.

Revolutions seldom admit of exact regulation. This insurrection is an appeal by force not merely to reverse a regular popular judgment, but to overturn the tribunal which pronounced it. I admit the importance of moderation on the part of the government. I think that all the world will agree that the government has thus far practiced that virtue to the largest possible extent. It has, however, produced no abatement of the ambitious designs of the insurgents. It is manifest that they prefer a common ruin, a complete chaos, to any composition whatever that could be made under any auspices. Nor does the case admit of offers of composition on the part of the Union. It is a question between the existing and only possible constitutional system of government and a resolution of society here into small, distracted, and ever-jealous belligerent states. Other unusual elements enter into the motives of the conflict, and popular passions inflame them into a white heat. It is impossible not to see that the conflict between universal freedom and universal slavery, which been so long put off, has come upon us at last in the form of a civil war, and that the parties are marshaling themselves under the banners of the Union and of the insurrection, respectively. Who has ever seen mediation or compromise arrest a conflict of that nature when brought to the trial of arms? No such conflict was ever ended but by exhaustion of one or both of the parties. Does it require a great discernment to see on which side exhaustion must first occur?

Does it require much loyalty to our institutions, or much faith in virtue, or much trust in the guidance of a beneficent Providence, to enable us to believe that that exhaustion must be rapid and complete enough to bring about a return of that portion of our people which has been misled to the constitutional government, which alone can maintain peace, preserve order, and guarantee practical freedom to all the members of the state? Where are we now? The Union is distracted, but it is not broken nor even shaken. It still maintains its authority everywhere, with local exceptions, as before. It still maintains its place in the councils of nations. It has only begun to draw upon its resources and its forces. The insurrection is without position at home or abroad. It has nearly exhausted its resources, and it is bringing into the field the last armies, available by conscription. No revolution, prolonged without success, escapes the avenger of faction among its movers. That avenger is even now upon the heels of the movers of the insurrection, and it appears with terrors such as failing revolutionists were never before compelled to turn upon and confront. Let any statesman look into the elements of society in the Gulf or revolutionary States, and see what else than universal ruin of society can result from longer war against the Union. What else than the protection of the Union duly accepted can arrest that desolation, or restore safety even then to property, liberty, and life.

I am sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 368.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, October 10, 1862.

SIR: Your dispatch of the 25th of September (No. 226) has been received.

The President is gratified by the tribute you have paid to the prudence and fidelity of Mr. Dayton.

Mr. Dayton has given me an account of an informal and unofficial conversation with which he was lately favored by Mr. Thouvenel, which indicates a harmony between him and Mr. Mercier in despondency concerning the success of the Union arms, but not any sentiments of hostility or of unfriendliness to this government.

I learn, also, from Mr. Sanford, that Baron Talleyrand, on his recent return from Paris to Brussels, informed Mr. Sanford that Mr. Thouvenel had said to him that business was suspended at Paris until the return of the Emperor from Biarritz, after which they should take up the Italian and the *American questions*.

This government has nothing to say concerning the first of these subjects.

In regard to the latter, it is certain that the aspect of the case for the enemies of the Union, when the time for that consideration shall have come, will be found to have changed much for the worse from what it was when Mr. Thouvenel was conversing with Baron Talleyrand. Recent events indicate a loss by the insurgents of even more than the prestige they won by their desperate attempt to invade and subjugate the loyal States of the republic. The Emperor of France is extensively regarded in European circles as an arbitrator among nations; but we

are not aware that he has ever affected so important and hazardous a trust. We do him no such injustice as to suppose him hostile to the United States, or disposed to do them a wrong. However the case may prove in this respect, we do no such injury to our cause, and no such violence to our national self-respect, as to apprehend that the Union is to be endangered by any foreign war that shall come upon us unprovoked and without excuse.

However public opinion, either here or in foreign countries, may veer with the varying chances of war, it must be understood by all the representatives of the United States abroad that the President indulges no apprehensions of a failure of the people in their determined purpose of maintaining the federal Union.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

No. 208.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, October 14, 1862.

SIR: Your circular, dated September 22, 1862, and the proclamation of the President of the same date, in relation to the abolition of slavery, were received at the legation on the 7th instant.

It is needless to say that these papers are of great interest. They have already been, or soon will be, published throughout the civilized world, and, wherever published or known, will at once fix the attention of mankind.

You may look immediately for the most mischievous efforts from portions of the foreign press to pervert and misconstrue the motives which have prompted the proclamation, and the probable consequences which will follow it. You must not be surprised if another spasmodic effort for intervention is made, based upon the assumed ground of humanity, but upon the real ground that emancipation may seriously injure the cause of the South, and will interfere, for years to come, at least, with the production of cotton.

But whatever may be the motive which prompts emancipation, or the immediate consequences which may follow it, the act will remain, and this cannot fail, in the end, to commend itself to the enlightened conscience of the Christian world.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 372.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, October 18, 1862.

SIR:

On the other hand, there are manifest symptoms of not only exhaustion but of reaction in the insurrectionary region. The language of defi-

ance there is hushed, while a desire for peace is very freely and generally expressed. It is manifest, from the tone of insurgent organs, that the proclamation of the President is filling the insurrectionary region with serious apprehensions, and this circumstance sufficiently indicates a failure of expectation of repelling the national arms from the home and haunts of African slavery. If we correctly understand the affairs of the insurgents, their last available forces are already in the field, and are very inferior to the Union armies in numbers and efficiency, while their leaders have not yet done, and are not able to do, anything to establish a system of revenue that could enable them to maintain the struggle in which they have already lavished so much of their wealth and strength. It would seem to result from this view that the crisis of the insurrection has come, and that its last hopes are staked upon foreign intervention.

Upon that point nothing has been left unsaid by this government. If there have been intimations from abroad of the possibility of such a course, they have been met with the reply that this nation will not consent to be divided, nor to recognize relations of friendship with any power that shall lend its aid to such a dangerous purpose. To this determination the President adheres. He feels confident that he is right in believing that even foreign intervention could not now endanger the Union that he is sworn to maintain and preserve.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCOIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 376.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, October 21, 1862.

SIR: I transmit herewith, for your information, a copy of an instruction of yesterday, (No. 237,) addressed to Mr. Dayton, in relation to alleged purposes of Great Britain and France to recognize the independence of the States in insurrection against this government. You may make any use of this dispatch which you may deem advisable.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCOIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

No. 237.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, October 20, 1862.

SIR: Your dispatch of the 2d of October (No. 202) has been laid before the President. It is desirable that the views I am now to express should be understood as official, and that, with such reserve as your discretion may deem proper, they may be made known to the French government. For this reason I do not draw under review the unofficial conversation with Mr. Thouvenel which you have related, but I base these intimations upon information of a general character which has reached this department.

The effect of this information is that Great Britain and France are seriously considering the question of recognizing the insurgents of this country as a sovereign State. Of course, the grounds of such a proceeding must involve a conclusion that the insurgents have shown their ability to maintain a national independence. We now know, although it was for a time studiously concealed from this government and the American people, that so early as the reverses which befell our army in front of Richmond, the insurgent leaders projected and began to prepare a campaign with the very comprehensive purpose of invading the loyal free States by armies which should occupy and permanently establish themselves in the loyal border States of Maryland, Kentucky, and Missouri. In this way Philadelphia and New York were to be menaced, while Baltimore and New Orleans were to be captured, and this capital was to be reduced to capitulation. We know also that the project of this campaign was confidentially communicated to parties in Europe who sympathized with the insurrection, and who became active in furnishing aid, arms, and supplies for its execution. We know further, that from a natural impulsiveness, if not from deep design, the emissaries of the insurgents excited very sanguine expectations of the success of their proposed campaign in the principal European cabinets. We have learned further that, besides enlisting under the influence of that excitement many persons of assumed importance as advocates of a recognition of the insurgents, a great pecuniary speculation in cotton was opened to others who might be moved by mercenary inducements to lend their aid to the same conspiracy against the United States. Chimerical as this scheme seemed to calm observers here while it was being developed through the maneuvers of the insurgents, it nevertheless borrowed a certain measure of probability of success from the surprise it excited, from inaugural military advantages gained in the region of Manassas, and from a seeming, though unreal, dilatoriness of the loyal States in sending forward the new levies for which the President had called. The apparent depression thus manifested here of course was observed in Europe, and doubtless it went far to fortify the sanguine expectations of the success of the anticipated campaign which prevailed there. Those expectations reached such a height that all Europe was seen actually looking for nothing less than the surrender of Washington and the dissolution of the Union, when it received, through the telegraph, the very different intelligence of the defeats of the insurgents at South Mountain and Antietam. In view of these facts, this government was not at all surprised when it heard, through the dispatches of its representatives in the European capitals throughout the months of August and September, that confident expectations were prevailing there of an early recognition of the independence of the insurgents, and that European statesmen, assuming that recognition to be imminent, were benevolently engaged in considering what substitute they could propose to the United States for the loss of their venerated and invaluable federal Union. It does, however, surprise the President that the expectations of a recognition of the insurgents are still lingering in European capitals, in view of the disappointment and failure of the campaign, which by its success was to prepare them for that hostile measure.

Waiving the temptation to bring military events singly into a tedious review, it will be sufficient on this occasion to say that the military and political situations in this country are in perfect contrast with the imaginary ones which were expected to win the advantages of European intervention. Instead of being in possession of, or threatening Phila-

delphia and New York, and occupying Cincinnati, Louisville, New Orleans, Baltimore, and Washington, the invading armies of the insurgents in the East, in the West, and in the South, are in retreat before the national forces, and as rapidly as possible evacuating all the loyal border States. On the first of July last the government had retained from the first the entire occupation of all those portions of the Union which had not been in the beginning betrayed into the secession movement; and it had also regained so many of the forts, rivers, and positions, which were thus at first betrayed, that, by the general consent of all observers, the revolt was deemed as practically suppressed. The projected insurgent campaign has been put into a train of military execution, and although that train is perhaps not yet ended, enough has occurred to prove the entire failure of all its objects. Not one important strategic point which the government held in July last has been lost. It is still in possession or in control now, as it was then, of the coasts, the rivers, the lakes, the marts, and the forts of the country, and, except by luck and adventure, no enemy of the United States can leave the country, and no ally of the insurgents can enter it. Such is the military situation now.

What are the prospects of the insurgents? Their credit and resources are practically exhausted. With a floating debt of four hundred millions, represented by paper which is at a discount of seventy-five per cent., they have neither received, nor have they the means of raising, a revenue equal to ten millions, in any form, applicable either to the defraying of present expenses or the payment of interest on existing or future obligations. Their armies were raised by conscription, which left them no reserves. Those armies, wasted like our own, by the casualties of war, are reduced to a condition of ineffectiveness, and cannot be renewed. Want and distress, hitherto unknown within the political jurisdiction of the United States, are already disclosing themselves in fearful forms throughout the entire region occupied by the insurgents. Industry has ceased, and thrift is lost. Do the leaders even propose a new campaign to retrieve the failure of the one that is approaching its end? No; they are looking out for winter quarters, and are calculating on the chances that foreign intervention may secure for them a peace which they are as yet unwilling to ask, although unable to conquer.

What, on the other hand, is the condition of the government and the loyal people, whose cause it is defending? It has a revenue available in the precious metals of more than a hundred millions applicable to present expenses, and the interest on a national debt of five hundred millions. It is as punctual in all its payments and as solvent as any government now existing or that ever has existed. Its second army, just now entering the field, is larger than the first; and it has a third and even a fourth army, as large as the present one, in reserve, if there shall, unhappily, be occasion for it. The marine force which has hitherto been employed with so much effect was not even a miniature or a model of the navy which is now going forth from its navy yards. Our mines are yielding gold more rapidly than foreign trade can withdraw it from us; and after supplying our own population, including our armies, with bread, we are shipping a surplus which silences the alarms of famine in Europe. Is the national mind unsteady or its tone unsound? Let its alacrity in sending the new levies of six hundred thousand strong into the field in a period of two months answer this question. The people do, indeed, desire peace and repose, as they have all along have desired these objects; but the first voice has yet to be raised in demand for peace at such a cost as a loss of the Union, or even of an acre of the broad foundation that

it covers. Since the European ideas of the failure of the government were formed a new political event has occurred, which has too much significance to be overlooked. The President, practically with the consent of the American people, has given notice to the insurrectionary slave States that if they refuse after the first day of January next to resume their constitutional relation to their sister States, and persevere in this desolating war, slavery shall, from and after that day, cease within their borders; and national armies and navies are now going forward to make that announcement, if it shall become necessary, a fact. It may be true, as European statesmen so constantly insist, that the slave masters inhabiting the region in insurrection will not submit. Human nature, on the other hand, will teach those statesmen that, though the masters may persist in refusing the Union, the slaves will not reject their offered freedom. If one needs aid to find out how this new but necessary operation of the war will work, he has only to look at the map of the insurrectionary region, and see that that part of the Mississippi which it embraces is inhabited by a population of whom an average of twenty per centum are white men and all the rest are African slaves. Without design on the part of the government, against its most benevolent efforts, the slave masters of the insurrectionary States have brought their system of African slavery directly into conflict with the government in its struggle to maintain and preserve the American Union. They have done this under the influence of a reckless and desperate ambition. If they persist, after the reasonable and ample warning they have received, they must lose the factitious social condition which has been the sole spring of their disloyalty and treason. Are the enlightened and humane nations Great Britain and France to throw their protection over the insurgents now? Are they to enter, directly or indirectly, into this conflict, which, besides being exclusively one belonging to a friendly people of a distant continent, has also, by force of circumstances, become a war between freedom and human bondage? Will they interfere to strike down the arm that so reluctantly but so effectually is raised at last to break the fetters of the slave, and seek to rivet anew the chains which he has sundered? Has this purpose, strange and untried, entered into the counsels of those who are said to have concluded that it is their duty to recognize the insurgents? If so, have they considered, further, that recognition must fail without intervention; that intervention will be ineffectual unless attended by permanent and persisting armies, and that they are committing themselves to maintain slavery in that manner among a people where slaves and masters alike agree in the resolution that it shall no longer exist? Is this to be the climax of the world's progress in the nineteenth century?

The European impulses favorable to recognition of the insurgents are due chiefly to the earnestness with which they have announced their resolution to separate. In this respect they can surpass us. We, the loyal people of this Union, are less demonstrative. We are necessarily so. Time works against the insurgents and in our favor. Reason and conscience are on our side; passion alone on theirs. We have institutions to preserve, and responsibilities world-wide and affecting future ages to discharge; they have none. They are at liberty to destroy, and trust to future chances to rebuild; we must save our institutions, not only for ourselves, but even for them. I trust however, that, even if the early operations of the government left room for any misapprehension on the subject, the decision and the energies which this government and the loyal people have put forth within the last three months will satisfy Europe that we are not only a considerate but a practical and persever-

ing people. It is time that we should be understood there. In one sense—a generous one—it is true, as Earl Russell has said, we are fighting for empire. But the empire is not only our own already, but it was lawfully acquired, and is lawfully held. Extensive as it is, it is none the less in every part our own. We defend it, and we love it with all the affection with which patriotism in every land inspires the human heart. It has the best of institutions—institutions, the excellence of which is generously and even gratefully conceded by all men, while they are endeared to ourselves by all national recollections, and by all the hopes and desires we so naturally cherish for a great and glorious future. Studying to confine this unhappy struggle within our own borders, we have not only invoked no foreign aid or sympathy, but we have warned foreign nations frankly and have besought them not to interfere. We have practiced justice towards them in every way, and conciliation in an unusual degree. But we are none the less determined for all that to be sovereign and to be free. We indulge in no menaces and no defiance. We abide patiently and with composure the course of events and the action of the nations, whose forbearance we have invoked scarcely less for their sakes than for our own. We have not been misled by any of the semblances of impartiality or of neutrality which unfriendly proceedings towards us in a perilous strife have put on. When any government shall incline to a new and more unfriendly attitude, we shall then revise with care our existing relations towards that power, and shall act in the emergency as becomes a people who have never yet faltered in their duty to themselves while they were endeavoring to improve the condition of the human race.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 248.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, October 24, 1862.

SIR: Following up the plan suggested in my dispatch No. 243, I asked an interview with Lord Russell. He gave it to me yesterday. The cabinet meeting appointed for that time had been postponed until to-day, which will yet be in season for the departure of Lord Lyons, who goes in the Scotia to-morrow. My surmise as to the connection between the two events proved correct.

I then turned in a half serious way to the departure of Lord Lyons, and expressed a hope that he was about to go with a prospect of remaining for some length of time. For myself I was obliged to confess that I had lately been called somewhat suddenly to the consideration of the condition of my traveling equipage, in certain possible contingencies, which at one moment seemed to approach more nearly than I liked. If I had trusted to the impressions generally prevailing here, directly after the delivery of a certain speech, my conclusions as to my departure would have been absolute. But I preferred to wait until later developments like those which had since taken place should give a more definite idea of

the extent of the authority to which it was entitled. The speech of Sir George Lewis had done much to set the balance once more even.

His lordship took my allusion at once, though not without a slight indication of embarrassment. He said that Mr. Gladstone had evidently been much misunderstood. I must have seen in the newspapers the letters which contained his later explanations. That he had certain opinions in regard to the nature of the struggle in America, as on all public questions, just as other Englishmen had, was natural enough. And it was the fashion here for public men to express such as they held in their public addresses. Of course it was not for him to disavow anything on the part of Mr. Gladstone; but he had no idea that in saying what he had there was a serious intention to justify any of the inferences that had been drawn from it, of a disposition in the government now to adopt a new policy.

I replied that I did not expect a disavowal nor even did I seek to impute to Mr. Gladstone an intention of the kind referred to. At the same time, I could not sufficiently express my great regret at the occurrence on account of the ill effects it was likely to have upon the relations of the two countries. On the one side, it would be reprinted in every newspaper in America, and construed as an official exposition of the policy of the government; and in this view it was scarcely necessary for me to say how much it would tend to increase the irritation already very great there. On the other, it was having a great effect in concentrating the popular inclination in this kingdom which was swaying every day more and more unfavorably to us. I regretted to be obliged to confess that from the day of my arrival I had observed a regular and steady decline of good will towards the United States. Lord Lyons had been to see me in the morning. Whilst we had united in deploring the respective tendencies on the two sides, we had also joined in expressing our intention to continue our utmost efforts to counteract them. But, for my part, I was much less sanguine of success when I perceived the influences brought to bear upon opinion here by leading men.

Lord Russell admitted that opinions were much divided and that there had been an unfavorable change to us going on. But he still thought that in most popular meetings the greater number would sympathize with the United States.

To which I replied that, admitting it might be so now, this slight preponderance would soon disappear under the effect of two or three more speeches like that of Mr. Gladstone. Whilst I was willing to acquit him of any deliberate intention to bring on the worst effects, I could not conceal from myself the fact that he was doing it quite as certainly as if he had one.

His lordship intimated as guardedly as possible that Lord Palmerston and other members of the government regretted the speech, and Mr. Gladstone himself was not disinclined to correct, so far as he could, the misinterpretation which had been made of it. It was still their intention to adhere to the rule of perfect neutrality in the struggle, and to let it come to its natural end without the smallest interference, direct or otherwise. But he could not say what circumstances might happen from month to month in the future. I observed that the policy he mentioned was satisfactory to us, and asked if I was to understand him as saying that no change of it was now proposed. To which he gave his assent.

I remarked that this answer left me nothing more to trouble him with, and then took my leave.

I ought to observe that before my interview I met with Baron Brun-

now, the Russian ambassador, in the ante-chamber, and he took me aside on his return from his conference to express his firm belief that the government here intended faithfully to adhere to their policy. He reminded me of a former meeting of the same kind, when I appeared to doubt, and he had said the same thing. So far, he had proved to be right. I admitted the fact, but added that at some future time I might, perhaps, be able to put him in possession of the evidence which had then affected my judgment. I could not do it just now.

The public speeches of members of Parliament to their constituents appear in the papers almost every day. I think they are much more guarded than they were just after Mr. Gladstone's. The general opinion now is that he was very indiscreet. But I see no change in the current. Indeed, nothing short of a very decisive victory in Virginia will avail to check it.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 250.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,

London, October 28, 1862.

SIR : There is so decided an official tone in the leader in the *Globe* of Saturday last that I deem it advisable to put you in possession of it out of the ordinary course. The cabinet meeting which was called for Thursday did not take place; but there can be no doubt that the policy marked out in this publication must have been informally agreed upon for the guidance of Lord Lyons on his departure the same day. Doubtless his lordship will have himself enlightened you before this arrives.

* * * * *

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

Secretary of State.

[From the *London Daily Globe* of October 25.]

Lord Lyons leaves England to-day to resume his post as the representative of her Majesty at Washington. We have no doubt that the ability and discretion by which his tenure of that office has been hitherto marked will continue to stand the country in good stead, and that our intercourse with the President's government will remain as peaceful and uninterrupted as the best friends of England and America could wish. At a moment of great delicacy and difficulty Lord Lyons comported himself to the complete satisfaction of his government and the public, and should he have any similarly grave task before him he will doubtless fulfill it with equal success. But the principal reason for our confidence in anticipating smoothness in our transatlantic relations is based upon the great improbability of any cause of political differences arising be-

tween the government at Washington and our own. We hear, indeed, of something like an inadmissible course of proceeding on the part of Commodore Wilkes in the Bahamas. As yet our information is imperfect, and we are unable positively to say how far that officer may have been trying to lay the foundation of a new chapter on international law, based on his own abnormal views, or whether he is merely exercising those rights in a somewhat vexatious manner, which are liberally accorded to belligerents by the usages of nations. But we feel sure that if Commodore Wilkes transgresses the fair bounds of warfare, his government will not sanction his acts, and as they repudiated him before, so, if there be occasion, they will repudiate him again. We have the fullest confidence that President Lincoln's government will not act in a manner to impose any unpleasant duty upon our representative at their capital.

On the part of her Majesty's ministers we may feel equally confident that no course will be pursued calculated to give any just cause of offense to the still great state beyond the Atlantic. Up to this our policy as regards the northern States has been clear, wise, and unselfish, and it will continue so. If impressions have arisen that any immediate change in our position as regards the belligerents was about to take place, and that Lord Lyons was to carry off in his pocket instructions likely to lead to a crisis on his landing, they have only originated in a kind of superabundant mental agility on the part of some of the public who have turned a fixed plank into a springboard, and have jumped from a minister's plain narration of a fact scarcely to be denied, to an extravagant and unjustifiable hypothesis. Many, no doubt, believed that the meeting of the cabinet appointed for last Thursday would result in the recognition of the southern confederacy, and those who somewhat inconsiderately press such an important step at the present moment upon the government have precedents cut and dried for our taking such a course. There is scarcely a single diplomatic step for which a precedent cannot be unearthed on both sides; and if the government were merely to follow precedent in a case of such extreme gravity, they would be miserable *doctrinaires*, instead of statesmen fit to judge of a great question upon its merits and its practical bearings on the vast interests involved. Pedants and enthusiasts may not look at consequences; but those who undertake to guide the councils of a great country must well weigh the advantages, and not only the probable but even the possible effects of what they recommend. Even those who are most eager for the recognition of the southern States as a member of the family of nations, even those who form the most sanguine estimate of its effects upon our own material interests, must admit that its accomplishment will precipitate upon us a future of great gravity, which it would be almost criminal for us to seek to hasten without the strongest reason and the most solemn consideration. We do not expect to find that her Majesty's government have resolved on such a course, or that they have adopted a policy the very expediency of which is debatable, even if its accomplishment were less difficult. When we speak of its expediency we do not use the word in any narrow or unworthy sense, but as regards the practical effect of the step in prolonging or terminating the contest by which America is convulsed and Europe shocked. We have no doubt that in the interests of humanity and civilization the government of Great Britain would be glad to take any steps and assume any responsibility if there were a prospect of their being able to change this vast scene of fratricide into one of peace. But suggestions, still less interference, should only be offered where the circumstances render it probable

that they would be effectual. In the present instance they would be met with difficulties at the very threshold, and might defeat their own object. While we all deplore the continuance of this struggle—while we would all make sacrifices to bring it to a termination—we must not forget the dictates of wisdom and avoid interference, at least until we have good reason to think it will not be useless or mischievous.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 387.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 4, 1862.

SIR: Your dispatches by the Arabia are received, but there is not time for special notice of them before the closing of the mail.

All our land and naval operations are going on with vigor. Those who in Europe have supposed that this government is either idle or ineffective will be undeceived in time, I trust, to abate their desires for measures which would bring the two continents into collision upon a question which belongs chiefly to America, but on which both continents ought to be agreed.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 389.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 4, 1862.

SIR: Your dispatch of October 17 has been submitted to the President. It is not pleasant to a loyal American to see a European cabinet discussing before a European people the question whether they will continue to recognize the existence of this republic. But this is a part of the painful experience of the evil times upon which we have fallen. While treason goes abroad from among ourselves to invite foreign nations to intervene, we have no right to expect those nations to judge us candidly, much less to judge us kindly or wisely. It would be, above all things, unreasonable to expect such charitable judgments from political parties in foreign countries, intent only on the objects of their own ambition. Fortunately we have the right to be free, independent, and at peace, whether European political parties wish us to be so or not. I think, also, we have the power to be so. While European parties, according to your representation, are even more hostile to our country now than ever before, it is, on the other hand, a source of much satisfaction to know that this same country of ours not only is but also feels itself to be stronger and in better condition and position to encounter dangers of foreign intervention than it has been at any former period; and that if any additional motive were necessary to sustain its resolution to remain united, independent, and sovereign, that motive would be found in the intervention by a foreign state in the great and painful domestic transactions in which it is engaged.

The wheel of political fortune makes rapid revolutions. It is less than three years since all Great Britain manifested itself desirous of the friend-

ship of the United States. A similar desire may, before the lapse of a long period, occur again. Neither politicians nor statesmen control events. They can moderate them and accommodate their ambitions to them, but they can do no more.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

No. 220.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, November 6, 1862.

SIR: The receipt of your circular No. 25 and of dispatch No. 237 are hereby acknowledged.

I have to-day had a conversation of some length with M. Drouyn de Lhuys in reference to our affairs. I told him that circumstances were such as to induce me to ask him distinctly whether any action was in contemplation by France, or by France conjointly with other powers, in reference to the condition of things in our country. He said no; that everything remained as it had done for some time past. That France, in common with the other powers of Europe, very much regretted the war and its continuance, but they had no purpose to intervene or interfere in any way. I then said to him I had seen it stated that France, England, and Russia were conferring upon the propriety of offering mediation. He said that the wish that the war could be ended, or that something could be done, with the assent of the belligerent parties, had been spoken of, and it was yet spoken of, but nothing had been resolved upon. In further conversation he said that France reserved to herself the right to express this wish to the parties if it should be thought advisable to do so, or that good would grow out of it. I told him that this at once brought us back to the starting point; that the expression of such wish would be, I presumed, but an offer of mediation in another form. He said no; if there were any word which could express *less* than "mediation," that such word should be used in its place.

To test the character of this offer or suggestion, which he reserved to himself the right to make, I said: Suppose your offer or suggestion, if made, shall be refused, what will be the consequences? He said, "Nothing;" that we would be friends, as we had been before. I told him then that I had just seen it stated in the English press that some such offer of mediation was to be made by the three powers, and, in the event of our refusal to accept it, the independence of the South was to be acknowledged. He said that was not so; that no such consequence would follow a refusal upon our part; that things would remain as before. I told him that we should look upon an acknowledgment of the South as but a form of intervention. To this he assented, and said that they did not think of intruding into our affairs in any way, or intervening in any form; that their intent would be comprised in the expression of a wish to be useful, if it could be done with the assent of both parties. I told him that the Emperor, at an early day, had expressed such wish, and that he had been willing to act the part of a friend between the two, if they should mutually request it. He said that such was yet his disposition, and nothing more, except that the calamities of this civil war had increased and strengthened the wish on his part.

I may add that I said to M. Drouyn de Lhuys, *unofficially*, however,

as I told him, that such an offer, if it should even be made, would come to nothing.

The above was the gist of the conversation, although other matters were embraced in it of which I may write you hereafter. As a whole, the conversation was very satisfactory, and I send it to you at once.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 392.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 10, 1862.

SIR: Your dispatch of October 24 (No. 248) has been received. It is a source of satisfaction to know that the expectations that Great Britain would speedily give her aid to sustain the failing insurrection here, which disloyal citizens at home and abroad had built upon the extra-official speeches of the British chancellor of the exchequer, were unreal and purely imaginary. The President trusts that the day is far distant, indeed, he hopes a day may never come, when two kindred nations shall consent to apply to purposes of mutual destruction energies which, if combined, are capable of carrying forward to a pitch never yet fully contemplated the improvement in the condition and character of mankind. Such an apprehension could never have entered the American mind if it had not been schooled by the experiences of our present unnatural civil war to fear that popular but ephemeral passion and prejudice may sometimes, in any country, overmaster all sentiments of national prudence, truth, justice, and humanity.

This government does not fail to see what Europe wants, and to see that it is just what the United States want, namely, a speedy and absolute conclusion of the war. Nor does the government fail to see that it is demanded with equal impatience on both continents. It may be possible that greater activity and energy than have been exhibited could have been put forth to secure that end. But it is believed that on a calm and critical examination it will appear that, considering the situation of the country, the very popular character, and the very complex republican form of the Constitution, the magnitude of the insurrection, the peculiarity of the moral and dynastic principles which are involved, and the foreign influences which have intervened, the progress which the government has made in suppressing the insurrection is an achievement which has never been surpassed.

At the present we are apprehending no insurmountable obstacles to complete success. Our army in Virginia, as you will learn from the newspapers, is already approaching the Rapidan, without having encountered serious opposition. General Grant is advancing into the heart of Mississippi. General Rosecrans is moving forward in Tennessee. Expeditions by land and water, greater in force than any preceding one, will soon be on their way to the southern coast.

The conviction which I have so confidently expressed to you during the last six weeks, that the insurrection is becoming exhausted, and which event seemed so strange at the time and under the circumstances when it was expressed, is now becoming generally accepted, and I see with pleasure that it begins to find favor in England. You did not exag-

gerate, in your conversation with Earl Russell, the injurious influences here of the speech of the chancellor of the exchequer. Indeed, no one can even fully appreciate the importance which nations, when excited, attach to the conventional utterances of persons in authority. When it is remembered that a year ago the public mind in Great Britain, and even that of her Majesty's government, was affected by the representation of alleged speeches and conversations of my own, delivered before my coming into my present position, it seems strange that a British minister should be willing to speak extra-officially and without a government purpose, upon an American question in a sense which might be interpreted as one of intervention, if not of menace. It was to prevent all such unfortunate proceedings on the part of the representatives of the United States that the new restraints upon our ministers and consuls, of which you have already been advised, were imposed.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extracts.]

No. 259.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, November 13, 1862.

SIR: * * * * *

It now appears that the Emperor of France has taken a positive step. The letter of M. Drouyn de Lhuys to the two powers of Russia and England appears in the newspapers. Mr. Dayton will, doubtless, give you by this steamer a full report of the communication that has been made to him by that minister, a brief abstract of which he has sent to me. It remains to be seen what fate it will meet from the parties to which it is addressed.

How it will fare with Russia I think there can scarcely be a doubt. Independently of the steady tone of Baron Brunnow, the ambassador at this court, in all his conversation with me, I find an article in a newspaper of authority at St. Petersburg, which very distinctly signifies an indisposition to interfere in any other way than that which has already been taken by Russia.

A cabinet council was held here yesterday, when there can be no doubt that some action was had on the subject.

Although I have not yet had an opportunity to know from authorized sources what the decision was, yet I have no doubt of its character, judging only from the tone of the leader in this morning's Times. Lord Russell has appointed a conference with me on the subject of the claims convention for Saturday, so that I shall postpone seeing him until that time, unless in the interval I should have any reason to doubt the correctness of my present impression.

Of course, if I am right as to the decision of these two parties, it results from what Mr. Dayton tells me of the declaration to him by the minister that there will be no action at all.

I ought to mention the fact that I have received from a good source the information, that prior to the date of the note of M. Drouyn de Lhuys, the King of the Belgians had addressed a note to the Emperor

of France, recommending the adoption of some such measure as that which has been taken.

* * * * * The proposition of an armistice of six months can come only from some party anxious to save the rebels from the immediate dangers that encompass them. It is, in other words, moral intervention of the most decisive character. It remains to be seen how long the unwillingness of the other great powers to give countenance to such a proceeding will deter him from undertaking to act alone. The preparatory steps taken in Mexico are not without their significance in this connection.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

HON. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extracts.]

No. 261.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,

London, November 15, 1862.

SIR: The reply of Earl Russell to the French note, which is published in all the morning papers, is sent herewith. It is sufficiently decisive to answer all present purposes. I have just returned from my conference with his lordship on the subject of the convention. The conversation which ensued was too long to be reported to-day. I can only say that it was friendly and satisfactory. I inquired if he had any information of the answer of the Russian court. He said that he had received only an abstract of it by the telegraph. I understood him that, in substance, it contained an expression of great interest in the communication, a desire not to stand in the way of any joint action that might be determined by the two powers, and a profession of a wish to help on any measures to restore peace in America that might be likely to prove acceptable to the United States.

It is a little remarkable that, both in England and France, the tendency of public opinion is gradually to fall into the old channel of party divisions. The advocates of strong power side with the rebels, while the more liberal and popular party befriend the cause of the government. This is becoming more and more visible as the struggle goes on. Efforts are now making here, with a good prospect of success, for a more effective organization of the anti-slavery sentiment in our behalf.

Since writing the above I have received the following telegram, purporting to give the substance of the Russian answer:

"ST. PETERSBURG, *November 15.*

"The 'Journal de St. Petersburg' of to-day contains the reply of Prince Gortschacow to the note of M. Drouyn de Lhuys.

"The Prince, after recalling the constant efforts of Russia in favor of conciliation in America, says: 'It is requisite, above all, to avoid the appearance of any pressure whatever capable of chilling public opinion in America or of exciting the susceptibility of the nation. We believe that a combined measure of the powers, however conciliatory, if presented in an official or officious (*officieux*) character, would risk arriving

at a result opposed to pacification. If, however, France should persist in her intention, and England should acquiesce, instructions shall be dispatched to Baron Stoeckl, at Washington, to lend to both his colleagues, if not official aid, at least moral support.”

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

[From British Blue Book entitled “Dispatch respecting the Civil War in North America.”]

[PRESENTED TO BOTH HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT BY COMMAND OF HER MAJESTY—1863.]

Earl Russell to Earl Cowley.

FOREIGN OFFICE, November 13, 1862.

MY LORD: The Count de Flahault came to the Foreign Office by appointment on Monday the 10th instant, and read to me a dispatch from M. Drouyn de Lhuys relative to the civil war in North America.

In this dispatch the minister for foreign affairs states that Europe has followed with painful interest the struggle which has now been going on for more than a year on the American continent. He does justice to the energy and perseverance which have been displayed on both sides, but he observes that these proofs of their courage have been given at the expense of innumerable calamities and immense bloodshed.

To these accompaniments of civil conflict is to be added the apprehension of a servile war, which would be the climax of so many irreparable misfortunes.

If these calamities affected America only, these sufferings of a friendly nation would be enough to excite the anxiety and sympathy of the Emperor. But Europe also has suffered in one of the principal branches of her industry, and her artisans have been subjected to the most cruel trials.

France and the maritime powers have, during this struggle, maintained the strictest neutrality, but the sentiments by which they are animated, far from imposing on them anything like indifference, seem on the contrary to require that they should assist the two belligerent parties in an endeavor to escape from a position which appears to have no issue.

The forces of the two sides have hitherto fought with balanced success, and the latest accounts do not show any prospect of a speedy termination of the war.

These circumstances taken together would seem to favor the adoption of measures which might bring about a truce.

The Emperor of the French, therefore, is of opinion that there is now an opportunity of offering to the belligerents the good offices of the maritime powers. He therefore proposes to her Majesty, as well as to the Emperor of Russia, that the three courts should endeavor, both at Washington and in communication with the Confederate States, to bring about a suspension of arms for six months, during which every act of hostility, direct or indirect, should cease, at sea, as well as on land. This armistice might, if necessary, be renewed for a further period.

This proposal, M. Drouyn de Lhuys proceeds to say, would not imply,

on the part of the three powers, any judgment on the origin of the war, or any pressure on the negotiations for peace, which it is hoped would take place during the armistice. The three powers would only interfere to smooth obstacles, and only within limits which the two interested parties would prescribe.

The French government is of opinion that, even in the event of failure of immediate success, these overtures might be useful in turning the minds of men, now heated by passion, to consider the advantages of conciliation and of peace.

Such is, in substance, the proposal of the government of the Emperor of the French, and I need hardly say that it has attracted the serious attention of her Majesty's government.

Her Majesty is desirous of acting in concurrence with France upon the great questions now agitating the world, and upon none more than on the contingencies connected with the great struggle now going on in North America. Neither her Majesty the Queen nor the British nation will ever forget the noble and emphatic manner in which the Emperor of the French vindicated the law of nations, and assisted the cause of peace, in the instance of the seizure of the confederate commissioners on board the Trent.

Her Majesty's government recognize with pleasure, in the design of arresting the progress of war by friendly measures, the benevolent views and humane intentions of the Emperor.

They are also of opinion that if the steps proposed were to be taken the concurrence of Russia would be extremely desirable.

Her Majesty's government have, however, not been informed up to the present time that the Russian government have agreed to co-operate with England and France on this occasion, although that government may support the endeavors of England and France to attain the end proposed.

But is the end proposed attainable at the present moment by the course suggested by the government of France?

Such is the question which has been anxiously and carefully examined by her Majesty's government.

After weighing all the information which has been received from America, her Majesty's government are led to the conclusion that there is no ground at the present moment to hope that the federal government would accept the proposal suggested, and a refusal from Washington at present would prevent any speedy renewal of the offer.

Her Majesty's government think, therefore, that it would be better to watch carefully the progress of opinion in America; and if, as there appears reason to hope, it may be found to have undergone, or may undergo hereafter, any change, the three courts might then avail themselves of such change to offer their friendly counsel with a greater prospect than now exists of its being accepted by the two contending parties.

Her Majesty's government will communicate to that of France any intelligence they may receive from Washington or Richmond bearing on this important subject.

Your excellency may read this dispatch to M. Drouyn de Lhuys, and give him a copy of it.

I am, &c.,

RUSSELL.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 227.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, November 18, 1862.

SIR: Herewith I inclose to you the copy of a communication just made to Monsieur Drouyn de Lhuys.

* * * * *

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Dayton to M. Drouyn de Lhuys.

PARIS, *November 16, [17,] 1862.*

MONSIEUR LE MINISTRE: In a recent conversation had with your excellency you asked some questions in relation to the population of the southern States of the United States and the position of the several divisions of our army. This, in connection with a statement in your dispatch of the 30th October to his Majesty's ambassadors at London and St. Petersburg, *officially published*, induces me to make to you this communication.

Although that dispatch was not addressed to me or to my government, yet it so intimately concerns the latter that I am sure I shall be excused if I refer to it in connection with the subject-matter of our conversation. I do this not with a view to any criticism or the expression of any opinions beyond those already given by me, but to correct, so far as I can, what seems to me a misapprehension of facts.

I do this in the hope that, should the question present itself for consideration in the future, your excellency may be induced to review your opinion as to the strength of the parties involved in the war now existing in the United States.

Your excellency says: "There has existed between the belligerents from the very outset of the war an equality of strength which has been almost constantly maintained ever since, and after so much bloodshed, they are now in this respect very nearly in the same position as at first. Nothing justifies the expectation of any more decided military operations at an early day."

In answer to your questions in our conference of the 11th instant I endeavored, with the aid of a map, to point out the districts of country occupied at present by the several divisions of our army.

If your excellency can, from memory, recall those positions and compare them with the condition of things at "the very outset of the war," (or even as it has been within the past year,) you will find cause, I am sure, for grave doubt as to the accuracy of opinion expressed in the above extract.

A little more than a year ago the whole of the slave States south of the Potomac and Ohio, and west of the Mississippi, (thirteen in all,) were in possession of the insurgents, except only a small locality in Virginia opposite to Washington; a tract of country in the same State, to the west of the Alleghany Mountains, in which there was a mixed possession; the

northern part of Kentucky, and perhaps one-half of Missouri. With these exceptions, they held undisputed sway of the entire country of the South. They possessed, at the same time, the military arsenal at Harper's Ferry and the vast naval arsenals and dockyards at Norfolk and Pensacola. They had likewise possession of the eastern shore of Chesapeake Bay, which, in connection with the command of the Potomac, gave them control over the access by water to Washington, the capital of the nation. They have lost during the year the eastern shore of the Chesapeake and the command of the Potomac, the city of Norfolk with its arsenals and dockyard, and neighboring country, and the dockyards at Pensacola.

They have lost all Virginia west of the Alleghanies, Kentucky and Missouri, and part of Tennessee, comprising, among other points, Nashville, its capital, and Memphis, its commercial port on the Mississippi. They have lost every port, harbor, and fortification on the Atlantic coast of any value, (those at Charleston alone excepted,) from the mouth of the Chesapeake to the southern point of Florida, and thence around the Gulf coast to Pensacola. But more important even than this, they have, within the year, lost New Orleans, the great commercial metropolis of the South, with the numerous fortifications established for its defense. They have likewise lost the Mississippi, with every island and river fortification (save that at Vicksburg) by which it was defended. This river, which drains the entire valley of the West, and cuts in two the slave States from Cairo to the Gulf, and on which could float the navies of the world—which can neither be forded nor bridged—must forever separate the four slave States and their contiguous territories on its West side from those on the East. The loss of this river was more injurious to the cause of the insurrectionists than the loss of many battles. Conscious that this would be so, it was fortified, your excellency will remember, not only at its mouth, and below and at New Orleans, but at every available point upwards; yet it, with its many fortifications, (Vicksburg alone excepted,) has, within the year, been lost to the South. The Tennessee and the Cumberland—great interior rivers of the West—with their defenses and fortifications, have likewise been taken, after a hard struggle, by the armies of the Union.

In a word, the insurgents do not now hold a foot of ground which they did not hold early in the war, while the flag of the Union has been constantly advanced, and now floats somewhere on the soil or over the fortifications of every slave State, save one. Their armies have, in the meantime, been driven from an area of country embracing, in the aggregate, not less than one hundred thousand square miles, and occupied by a population ranging from one million and a half to two millions of people.

But in war "equality in strength" consists not in these things only. Permit me, therefore, to remind your excellency that, while all the incipient efforts on the part of the South to create a navy have been defeated and her vessels destroyed, the navy of the United States has, within the year, grown from a very small to a very great power—closing the ports of the South, precluding, save with our consent, all entrance to or exit from them unless by stealth or accident. This power, which the South has little to meet, is almost exclusively the growth of the year, and on our own coasts, and in ports, harbors, and rivers of the South, it cannot but be in the future the most efficient means of attack or defense.

There are two other elements of strength which specially require consideration—men and money. The armies of the South have been large beyond example, as compared with the extent of population from which they have been drawn. To raise them to their present standard, the conscription law of the South has embraced all from the age of eighteen

to forty-five. Their armies, like our own, waste away by the casualties of war, and there can be little force in reserve to supply the constant drain. An examination of the Preliminary Report of the Census of 1860 (of which I have had the honor to transmit you a copy) will show, on page 131, that the body of the population upon which the South must draw for the supply of this drain is less even than I suggested in our recent conversation.

The aggregate free population of all the slave States, including Maryland, Delaware, Virginia, Kentucky, and Missouri, is only eight millions two hundred and eighty-nine thousand seven hundred and sixty-three, (8,289,763;) but from this must be deducted the population of those slave States in the possession of the United States where no conscription law of the South could possibly be enforced, and likewise the free blacks of the South, in whose hands they dare not place arms.

The free population of those States, shown by the census of 1860, is as follows:

Delaware.....	110, 418
Maryland.....	599, 860
Kentucky.....	930, 201
Missouri.....	1, 067, 081
Kanawha, or Western Virginia, with Jefferson, Accomac, and Northampton counties, estimated at.....	379, 774
Free blacks of the South to be deducted.....	250, 787
	<hr/>
Making an aggregate of.....	3, 338, 121
	<hr/>

Which number, deducted from the aggregate free population of the South, leaves only four millions nine hundred and fifty-one thousand six hundred and forty-two, including men, women, and children. The general accuracy of these figures can readily be tested by reference to pages 131, and 286, 287, 288, and 289 of the Census Report, before referred to. It is true that to some slight extent troops may voluntarily go into the southern army from portions of the country not in their possession, but these would probably be at least balanced by those withholding themselves along the coasts, and in the towns and cities of the South subject to our control, and for which no allowance is made in the above calculation.

I need not recapitulate the population of the free States and the border States in our possession.

The aggregate, by a reference to the same Census Report, will be seen to be within a fraction of twenty-two millions, (21,996,845.) During the last summer, in addition to the army then in the field, they raised, within the space of two months, principally by voluntary enlistment, six hundred thousand men, and there is yet another, and still another army in reserve, as I am instructed, to take their places, in whole or in part, should that unhappily become necessary. In the foregoing estimate I have taken no account of the slaves of the South as a source either of strength or weakness. As they have been used heretofore, they have certainly added strength to their masters. They have, in fact, fed the army. Some have been forced to labor with it in the trenches, while the great mass have toiled in the fields at home, thus leaving almost the entire population of the South free to fight its battles. Emancipation, should it occur, while it liberates the slaves, would cut off this source of strength from their masters.

Their supplies in the rear must be kept up or their army cannot be

held together. The one is essential to the maintenance of the other. A time may soon come, therefore, when, aside from the "apprehensions" incident to emancipation, the slaves of the South will be to their masters a source of weakness and not of strength. Permit me, however, here to add that, whoever may have entertained "apprehensions" of a "servile war," such I do not suppose for a moment to have been contemplated by the President in foreshadowing his policy of emancipation.

The slaves of the South, scattered over a vast extent of country, have no arms and no means of procuring them.

They have little intelligence, no means of distant intercommunication, and can have no general concert of action.

They may refuse to labor for their masters, and their masters cannot constrain them. The map left with your excellency, showing the percentage of slaves in each county of the South, will prove this beyond a question. In certain large sections of country, along the Mississippi more especially, there is about twenty-eight per cent. only of white population. All the rest are slaves. Of this population the able-bodied are now almost entirely away with the army.

Should attempts be made here, or in other sections, to constrain the slaves to a forced obedience, they may resist or they may leave their plantations, as many have already done, and seek the friendly shelter of the Union flag. But neither principle nor policy will induce the United States to encourage a "servile war," or prompt the slave to cut the throat of his master or his master's family.

The government will not even permit, as I have already said to you, its own soldiers or the soldiers of the enemy, acting as guerillas or marauders, belonging to no organized force and under no regular flag, to make war or attack even an armed enemy, without punishment; still less would it encourage or permit slaves to offend against humanity by attack upon the feeble and helpless. That an isolated case or cases of wrong may occur in the course of establishing a great change (if such shall be established) in the social organization of the South, is not improbable; but in every such case, I doubt not that the arm of the government would promptly interfere to protect and to punish. This, however, is matter incidental only to the subject of my communication. Leaving the question of population, I pass for a moment to the other great element of strength in war, and that is money.

I have already said that the resources of the South in men would seem to be practically exhausted, and their resources in money, I think, must be equally so. I am instructed that, with a floating debt of four hundred millions of dollars, represented by paper at a discount of seventy-five per cent., they have neither raised, nor have they the means of raising, a revenue equal to ten millions, in any form or for any purpose.

Want and distress are already disclosing themselves in painful forms throughout the entire region occupied by the insurgents. On the other hand, the government of the United States has, as I am instructed, a revenue, available in the precious metals, of more than a hundred millions, while its mines are yielding gold more rapidly than foreign trade withdraws it from the country. In this vital matter of finance, therefore, there does not seem to exist between the parties an equality of strength. So far, indeed, as I can see, such equality has existed nowhere except on certain battle-fields, and especially between the two great armies in Virginia. Here the insurgents have advanced and retreated. They have gained battles and lost them. I do not mean to depreciate their gallantry; they are yet my countrymen. Here at least they have

shown equality of strength; but everywhere else the permanent gain has been with the armies of the Union.

I avail myself of this occasion to renew to your excellency assurances of the most distinguished consideration, with which I have the honor to be

Your excellency's very obedient servant,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Monsieur DROUYN DE LHUYS,
Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 264.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, November 21, 1862.

SIR: I was so hurried at the close of the last week in my effort to report the result of my conference with Lord Russell in season for the steamer that I was unable to give you any detailed account of it. Although not very long in time, it embraced a conversation on three different subjects. The first was upon his lordship's note in answer to the French proposition which appeared in the newspapers of that morning. The substance of this was comprised in my letter, though I did not perhaps give in it a full idea of the extent of its amicable character. I tried to impress upon him a sense of my conviction of the uncertain nature of the Emperor's disposition towards us, and my greater confidence in the policy of this ministry to the extent that it declared itself. His lordship seemed to imply that such had not been the view taken in America; and he went so far as to say, in allusion to the fact announced in the newspapers that Mr. Slidell had been admitted to an audience of the Emperor, which is stated to have happened on the very same day of the date of M. Drouyn de Lhuys's note, that if any minister here had procured an audience of the Queen for Mr. Mason there would have been no end to the indignation among us. I replied that the knowledge of this event would unquestionably have its effect in diminishing the popular sympathy with France. I thought that this proposition of M. Drouyn de Lhuys would meet with no favor, and would, in conjunction with the reception of Mr. Slidell, be construed as an act of direct hostility. Here his lordship interposed a singular doubt. He intimated that from such reports as had been received of the reception of the overtures of M. Mercier at the time when the confederate forces were entering Maryland, he had been led to suppose that the government at Washington was not then entirely indisposed to accept his assistance. Strangely enough, I will add here that a precisely similar story has since come to me from France, through a wholly independent source. I replied to his lordship at once that I had received from you a full report of your conversation with M. Mercier at the time referred to, which was of a wholly opposite character, and that a copy of your subsequent dispatch to Mr. Dayton on the same subject had been placed in my hands, to be used here at my discretion, which was so strong in its terms that I did not think it advisable to show it to him at all. For as things seemed to me to be going on well enough as they were, I feared that in case of any immediate call upon her Majesty's government for action it might lead to embarrassment, as implying a decision under more or less

of constraint. I was the more glad I had taken such a view of it, as the course marked out in his reply to France was left clear from any question of its being perfectly spontaneous. His lordship said he thought my course had been judicious.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 231.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, November 25, 1862.

SIR: I received last night from M. Drouyn de Lhuys a communication, dated 23d instant, in answer to mine of the 17th, (dated by mistake the 16th.)

The communication of M. de Lhuys is of so much interest that I send you herewith a copy of the original and a translation.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys to Mr. Dayton.

[Translation.]

DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Palace of Compeigne, November 23, 1862.

SIR: I have learned with lively interest the information which you have been pleased to communicate to me upon the respective situation of the two belligerent parties in the United States.

You express to me the hope that these suggestions may modify my opinion as to the equilibrium of strength between the States of the North and those of the South, and they are certainly of a nature to make me appreciate all the resources of your government. But it is none the less true that, notwithstanding the inequality of numbers and of financial means, notwithstanding local advantages and partial conquests, the conditions of soil and climate seem to oppose insuperable obstacles to the progress of the struggle, and that the equal energy of both sides tends to impress upon it a character of indomitable desperation, ("*indomptable acharnement.*") I am pleased to render homage with you to the courage which the Americans, upon the one side and the other, have shown thus far; but this courage, even, while it excites the admiration of the world, is only calculated to render more uncertain the result ("*soit*") of the combats, and to retard the termination of the disasters of this bloody war.

You know, sir, what feelings this sad spectacle has given rise to in us. You know the step which a profound sympathy for America has inspired in the government of the Emperor, in the hope of opening the way to a reconciliation. This step, you know also, ought and could take place, (*"avoir lieu,"*) in the opinion of the Emperor, only with the consent and concurrence of the two belligerent parties. At present, the reception given to our proposition by the cabinets of London and St. Petersburg prevents us from thinking of pursuing it further, (*"empêche qu'il nous ne songions à y donner suite."*) But I can assure you, sir, that our friendly dispositions have not changed. If some day the Americans, tired of turning their valor against themselves, should wish to have recourse to us in order to seek in concert the means of terminating this conflict, they would find us always ready (be it in associating ourselves with other powers or be it separately) to aid them with our co-operation, and to testify, by our good offices, feelings which have not ceased to animate France in regard to them.

Receive, sir, the assurances of my most distinguished consideration.
DROUYN DE LHUYS.

Mr. DAYTON,
*Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary
of the United States at Paris.*

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

[Extract.]

No. 261.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 28, 1862.

SIR: Your dispatch of November 10 (No. 223) has been received only at this late day. * * *

I have now only to say that the views presented by me in my dispatch of October 20 are the deliberate and settled convictions of the government, always to be expressed when, in your judgment, any expression whatever on the subject of the action of foreign powers shall be either necessary or expedient.

In reply to a suggestion in your dispatch, it is proper for me to say that neither M. Mercier nor any other person has had the least warrant from any authority of the United States for representing to his government that the President would be disposed to entertain any proposition in regard to the action of this government in the conduct of our domestic affairs from any foreign quarter whatsoever. The exact contrary is the effect of all that has ever passed between all the ministers residing here and this department. You will judge whether it is important to clear up this point at Paris.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 1, 1863, p. 46.]

No. 50.

Lord Lyons to Earl Russell.

[Extract.]

WASHINGTON, November 28, 1862.

The intelligence that France had proposed to Great Britain and Russia to join her in advising the belligerents in this country to agree to an armistice reached New York by telegraph from Cape Race on the 25th instant. The substance of your lordship's answer was received at the same time. Yesterday the text of the French proposal, of your lordship's answer, and of the principal part of the Russian answer, was forwarded to New York by telegraph from Halifax.

It is to be observed that in every one of the newspapers I send foreign intervention is distinctly repudiated. It is very true that the leaders of the political parties do not always put forth in the newspapers exactly the same sentiments which they entertain and even express in private. Still, the unanimity of the press on the present occasion shows at least that this is not a time at which public opinion would force the acceptance of foreign mediation upon a reluctant cabinet.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 414.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, November 30, 1862.

SIR: I have received your dispatch of the 13th of November, (No. 259,) and also your dispatch of November 15, (No. 261.) They relate to the proposition recently made by the Emperor of France to the Emperor of Russia and to the Queen of Great Britain, to join him in recommending an armistice in our unhappy civil war. Your statements upon that subject are very interesting and satisfactory. At the same time I do not propose to discuss the transaction.

You will learn the impression it has made upon the President from the copy which I send you of my dispatch of this date to Mr. Dayton. I send a copy of the same paper to Mr. Taylor, in Russia; and thus, by the President's direction, I leave the French proposal to take its place among the incidents already past of the lamentable civil war of which we again think we are beginning to see an approaching end.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

[Extract.]

No. 263.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, November 30, 1862.

SIR: Your several dispatches of November 12, (No. 224,) November 13, (No. 225,) and November 14, (No. 226,) have been received. I

have also, by the aid of the telegraph, the substance of the invitation which was addressed by the Emperor of France to the Emperor of Russia and the Queen of Great Britain to join in recommending an armistice in our civil war, together with the answers of those two sovereigns declining that invitation.

In regard to the main subject my instructions will be very simple and short. An inconclusive conference concerning the United States has been held between three powers, all of whom avow themselves as friends of the United States, and yet the United States were carefully excluded from the conference. Neither party in the conference proposed any combination to coerce the will or control the policy of the United States.

Under these circumstances the United States are not called upon to say what they would have done if the proposition of France, which was declined by Russia and Great Britain, had been adopted and carried into effect. Nor are we called upon to discuss the propriety of the positions and proceedings respectively of the several parties in the conference. Such a debate upon a subject which has already lost its practical character, or which, to speak more accurately, has not attained such a character, might produce irritations and jealousies, which the President desires to avoid.

Acting upon these principles, we shall ask no explanations, nor shall we in any manner comment upon explanations which shall be voluntarily made. A government which is conducting a great nation through a civil war must deal continually with new events as they arise, not with those which have already fallen into history.

The United States has continually said to all Europe that they know that the saving of the American Union depends on the American people themselves, and not at all on the policies of foreign states, severally or combined. Such states may, as they have heretofore done, prolong and agitate our unnatural and lamented strife, by exciting or maintaining the hopes of our disloyal citizens, but they cannot change our purpose to maintain the integrity of the Union or defeat its accomplishment.

This government will in all cases seasonably warn foreign powers of the injurious effect of any apprehended interference on their part, and having done this, it will measure its means of self-defense by the magnitude of the dangers with which the country is threatened.

Foreign nations scarcely need to be reminded that family quarrels are always of short duration; that the very scandal which they bring operates as an incentive to reconciliation. Much more does the unavoidable apprehension of foreign interference work in that direction. The emissaries of treason who now remain in European capitals will very soon disappear, and the whole American people will forever afterwards be asking who among the foreign nations were the most just and the most forbearing to their country in its hour of trial.

It is the President's policy so to conduct our national affairs that all who have heretofore been our friends may abide in that relation.

If any of them shall be lost, our regret will thus be modified by the reflection that the bereavement resulted from our misfortune and without fault.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 1, 1863, p. 46.]

No. 51.

Lord Lyons to Earl Russell.

WASHINGTON, *December 2, 1862.*

MY LORD: Mr. Seward, without my having in any way led to the subject, spoke to me yesterday of the proposal made by France to Great Britain and Russia to unite in advising the belligerents in this country to agree to an armistice.

Mr. Seward said that he perceived that some of the European powers, all professing the most friendly feelings to this country, had been discussing its affairs among themselves without taking the cabinet of Washington into their counsels. However, as no official communication had been made to this government, it was not called upon to give any opinion, or to say what it should or should not have done if any proposal had been made to it. If any of the European powers concerned should offer explanations on the subject, this government would receive them respectfully, but would not be disposed to express any opinion on them.

Mr. Seward begged me to acquaint M. Mercier with what he had said. I accordingly went from Mr. Seward to M. Mercier and repeated to him what Mr. Seward had just stated to me.

I have, &c.,

LYONS.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dagton.

[Extract.]

No. 265.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 5, 1862.

SIR: Your dispatch of November 18 (No. 227) has been received. Having already indicated the course which the President has decided to adopt concerning the late proceeding of the French government, it is unnecessary for me now to review the note which, in the absence of instructions, you have written to Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 418.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 8, 1862.

SIR: Your dispatch of November 21 (No. 214) has been received.

The President is of opinion that the dignity of the country and the interests of peace concur in requiring forbearance on the part of this government from discussing the motives, objects, and legitimate tend-

ency of the late movement of France in regard to our national affairs. I may, perhaps, without departing from this course, inform you that the popular judgment in this country is unanimous in ascribing that proceeding to designs on the part of the Emperor which are not only hostile but aggressive. The President does not accept this interpretation, but thinks, on the contrary, that the proceeding was an ill-divised one, grounded upon erroneous assumptions in regard to the military and naval condition of the country, and a mistaken desire to counsel in a case where all foreign counsel excites distrust, and must be rejected with firmness. I may add, that the determination of Congress and of the people to hold the country in a condition of defense, adequate to meet any foreign intervention, has been intensified by the appearance of the proposition of Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys.

There is a very simple explanation of the misunderstanding into which the French government was led in regard to the disposition of the American people and their government, to which Earl Russell has referred. The insurgent invasion of the loyal States last summer, as I so often had occasion to show you, produced for the moment a state of apparent consternation and confusion, of which the sympathizers with the insurgents in New York profited in their intercourse with some of the foreign ministers residing in the United States. These ministers doubtlessly conveyed to their governments the sentiments and purposes, not of this government or of the people, but of a party which grew in the night of despondency, and disappeared so soon as the sunlight of national prosperity reappeared. It is a pleasing reflection now that no pains were spared by the President to counteract the mischief which was thus set on foot, and to save foreign nations from the inconveniences which it might bring upon them.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 271.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, December 11, 1862.

SIR:

The great obstacle in the way of the better understanding which would naturally follow from this state of things is to be found in the movements going on in this kingdom under the strong appeals making to the avarice of the commercial interest by the desperate insurgents. There is scarcely a limit to the extent of the offers made to secure assistance. Much of the evidence upon which I make this statement has been already laid before you from other quarters. It appears that a loan, to a large amount, has been effected on the security of cotton to be furnished at a price which would secure an enormous profit to the holders, and that a corresponding rate of gain has been held out for the delivery of goods of which the rebels now stand in the most absolute need. This discovery furnishes at last an explanation of the sources of the large sums of money which have been lavished at a most reckless rate in the

purchase and construction of steamers of all kinds, and munitions of war, in the dispatch of military adventurers from the continent, and in the purchase of every variety of article that is needed to supply existing domestic wants in those States. The ports of Liverpool and London are filled with vessels taking in commodities destined for the insurgents. At the same time a strong interest is thus formed, which must be brought to bear more or less forcibly upon the policy of the government toward the United States. The existence of loans here, which can gain value only by the recognition of the insurgents as a state, is, of itself, a material element of hostility to our success. Hence, there will be people not at all slow to inflame every little cause of difference between the two countries, and to stimulate to co-operation with the more positive policy of Napoleon in bringing about the only result that can secure favorable returns to their hazardous ventures.

* * * * *

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

No. 268.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, December 11, 1862.

SIR: Your dispatch of November 25 (No. 231) has been received, together with the note which Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys addressed to you on the 23d of November, by way of answer to your communication to him of the 17th of that month.

From my previous dispatches you will probably have inferred that the President did not expect you to open a correspondence with Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys upon the subject of the proposition concerning American affairs which the Emperor has recently submitted to the Emperor of Russia and the Queen of Great Britain. Inasmuch as you have done so without consulting this government, and have thus drawn forth from the imperial government a frank and friendly answer, it is only proper that you should now inform Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys that his note has been submitted to the President, and that he is gratified with the explanations it gives of the present policy of the Emperor in regard to the United States. You are authorized, also, to inform Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys that this government desires now, no less sincerely than it has always done, to retain and fortify its traditional relations with France, and that every proceeding which it shall have occasion to take in the conduct of international affairs shall manifest that spirit and no other. You are authorized further to say to Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys that this government appreciates the assurance which the Emperor has given us of his willingness at a future time, if invited by it, to render his good offices towards producing a termination of the civil war in which we are so unhappily engaged, and this assurance is received as a fresh demonstration of the same good will and cordial friendship to our country upon which this government and the American people have so constantly relied.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 1, 1863, p. 46.]

No. 52.

Earl Russell to Lord Lyons.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *December 19, 1862.*

MY LORD: I have received your lordship's dispatch of the second instant, and with respect to Mr. Seward's remarks, unprovoked on your part, that he perceived that some of the European powers, all professing the most friendly feelings to the United States, had been discussing its affairs among themselves without taking the cabinet of Washington into their counsels, I have to instruct you to take an opportunity of observing to Mr. Seward that, without taking other reasons into consideration, the perusal of the accounts of the distress in Lancashire, owing to the want of cotton, which he will find in all the newspapers, will furnish him with reason enough for the discussion of American affairs in Europe.

Great numbers of her Majesty's subjects are suffering severe distress in consequence of the belligerent operations of the cabinet of Washington.

I am, &c.,

RUSSELL.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 246.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, December 23, 1862.

SIR: Your dispatch of December 5 (No. 265) is received. You simply acknowledged the receipt of my dispatch of November 18, (No. 227,) and say that, "having already indicated the course which the President has decided to adopt concerning the late proceeding of the French government, it is unnecessary for me now to review the note which, in the absence of instructions, you [I] have written to Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys."

I had supposed that that note, as it did not assume to indicate any policy, but merely to sum up briefly the successes of our army and governmental resources, in the hopes of its having weight in any future deliberation of this government, could not fail, at least, to meet the approbation of the department. My general instructions in reference to the subject-matter were most ample, and I had held verbal conference with Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys on the subject before. He told me what he had done, and I could answer when, perhaps, the government could not. The emergency, I thought, not only justified, but required, that, in view of the possible future, I should put my verbal suggestions in writing. As one useful result, at all events, I have received the important communication of Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys of November 23 last, a copy of which accompanied my dispatch No. 231. I may add, also, that I felt that it was but just to myself that my countrymen, as well as the government, should see and know that I had not failed, in the crisis which had occurred, fairly to represent its condition.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

[Extract.]

No. 278.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 29, 1862.

SIR: * * * * * * *

The fact that the national attachment of this country to France is so pure and so elevated constitutes just the reason why it could be more easily supplanted by national insult or injustice than our attachment to any other foreign state could be. It is a chivalrous sentiment, and it must be preserved by chivalrous conduct and bearing on both sides. I deduce from the two positions which I have presented a conclusion which has the most solemn interest for both parties, namely, that any attempt at dictation—much more any aggression committed by the government of France against the United States—would more certainly and effectively rouse the American people to an attitude of determined resistance than a similar affront or injury committed by any other power. There is reason to believe that interested sympathizers with the insurrection in this country have reported to the French government that it would find a party here disposed to accept its mediation or intervention. I understand that they reckon upon a supposed sympathy between our democratic citizens and the French government. It may as well be understood as soon as possible that we have no democrats who do not cherish the independence of our country as the first element of democratic faith, while, on the other hand, it is partiality for France that makes us willingly shut our eyes to the fact that that great nation is only advancing towards, instead of having reached, the democratic condition which attracts us in some other countries.

* * * * * * *

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 1, 1863, p. 52.]

No. 58.

Lord Lyons to Earl Russell.

WASHINGTON, January 7, 1863.

MY LORD: I had the day before yesterday the honor to receive your lordship's dispatch of the 19th ultimo, referring to a remark which was made to me some time ago by Mr. Seward, that he perceived that some of the European powers had been discussing the affairs of the United States among themselves without taking the cabinet of Washington into their counsels. In obedience to your lordship's orders, I this morning took an opportunity of observing to Mr. Seward, with regard to this remark, that, without taking other reasons into consideration, the accounts of the distress in Lancashire would furnish him with reason enough for the discussion of American affairs in Europe.

Mr. Seward took the observation in very good part, and said that the distress of the operatives in Europe was indeed a most painful subject of reflection.

I have, &c.,

LYONS.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

[Extract.]

No. 283.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 9, 1863.

SIR: Your dispatch of December 23 (No. 246) has been submitted to the President.

My recent dispatches, especially No. 268, will have relieved you, I trust, of any concern about the caution which the President thought it prudent to observe, in the first instance, in relation to the note which you addressed to Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys immediately after the publication of his correspondence with the governments of Great Britain and Russia in relation to a proposed armistice was made. The note was opportune, and was judiciously conceived, and it has produced gratifying results.

* * * * *

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 255.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, January 15, 1863.

SIR: A dispatch will shortly be sent by Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys to Mr. Mercier, requesting him to suggest to you, on a suitable occasion, the propriety of appointing commissioners to treat with the South for peace, and for union, if possible; if not possible, for such terms of separation as may be mutually agreed upon. This communication was submitted by Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys to the Emperor on the 9th instant, and returned to him by the Emperor yesterday. The dispatch answers what it is supposed would have been the objections to a proposal for an armistice or mediation.

First. It proposes, it says, no interference of any kind by a foreign power.

Second. It does not require or ask any cessation of hostilities pending the negotiation, but, like the negotiations for peace in 1783, between us and Great Britain, permits everything to proceed as if no efforts for settlement were being made.

* * * * *

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys to Mr. Mercier.

[Translation.]

DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Political Division, Paris, January 9, 1863.

SIR: If, in forming the purpose of assisting, by the proffer of our good offices, to shorten the period of those hostilities which are desolat-

ing the American continent, we had not been guided, beyond all, by the friendship which actuates the government of the Emperor in regard to the United States, the little success of our overtures might chill the interest with which we follow the fluctuations of this contest; but the sentiment to which we have yielded is too sincere for indifference to find a place in our thoughts, and that we should cease to be painfully affected whilst the war continues to rage. We cannot regard without profound regret this war, worse than civil, comparable to the most terrible distractions of the ancient republics, and whose disasters multiply in proportion to the resources and the valor which each of the belligerent parties develop.

The government of his Majesty have, therefore, seriously examined the objections which have been made to us when we have suggested the idea of a friendly mediation, and we have asked ourselves whether they are truly of a nature to set aside as premature every tentative to a reconciliation. On one part has been opposed to us the repugnance of the United States to admit the intervention of foreign influences in the dispute; on the other, the hope, which the federal government has not abandoned, of attaining its solution by force of arms.

Assuredly, sir, recourse to the good offices of one or several neutral powers contains nothing incompatible with the pride so legitimate amidst a great nation, and was purely international, are not those alone which furnish examples of the useful character of mediators. We flatter ourselves, besides, that in proffering to place ourselves at the disposal of the belligerent parties to facilitate between them negotiations, the bases of which we abstain from prejudging, we have manifested to the patriotism of the United States all the consideration to which it is entitled, now, perhaps, still more than ever, after such new proof of moral force and energy. We are none the less ready, amid the wishes which we form in favor of peace, to take into account all the susceptibilities of national feeling, and we do not at all question the right of the federal government to decline the co-operation (*concours*) of the great maritime powers of Europe. But this co-operation, is it the only means which offers itself to the cabinet at Washington to hasten the close of the war? And if it believes that it ought to repel any foreign intervention, could it not honorably accept the idea of direct (*pour parlers*) informal conferences with the authority which may represent the States of the South.

The federal government does not despair, we know, of giving a more active impulse to hostilities; its sacrifices have not exhausted its resources, still less its perseverance and its steadfastness.

The protraction of the struggle, in a word, has not shaken its confidence in the definitive success of its efforts. But the opening of informal conferences between the belligerent parties does not necessarily imply the immediate cessation of hostilities. Negotiations about peace are not always the consequence of a suspension of warfare. They precede, on the contrary, more often the establishment of a truce. How many times have we not seen plenipotentiaries meet, exchange communications, agree upon all the essential provisions of treaties—resolve, in fine, the question even of peace or war—whilst the leaders of armies continued the strife, and endeavored, even to the latest moment, to modify by force of arms the conditions of the peace? To recall only one memory, drawn from the history of the United States, the negotiations which consecrated their independence were commenced long before hostilities had ceased in the New World, and the armistice was not established until the act of November 30, 1782, which, under the name of

provisional articles, embraced in advance the principal clauses of the definitive treaty of 1783.

Nothing, therefore, would hinder the government of the United States, without renouncing the advantages which it believes it can attain by the continuation of the war, from entering upon informal conferences with the confederates of the South, in case they should show themselves disposed thereto. Representatives or commissioners of the two parties could assemble at such point as it should be deemed proper to designate, and which could, for this purpose, be declared neutral. Reciprocal complaints would be examined into at this meeting. In place of the accusations, which the North and South mutually cast upon each other at this time, would be substituted an argumentative discussion of the interests which divide them. They would seek out, by means of well-ordered and profound deliberations, whether these interests are definitively irreconcilable, whether separation is an extreme which can no longer be avoided, or whether the memories of a common existence, whether the ties of every kind which have made of the North and South one sole and whole federative state, and have borne them on to so high a degree of prosperity, are not more powerful than the causes which have placed arms in the hands of the two populations. A negotiation, the object of which would be thus determinate, would not involve any of the objections raised against the diplomatic intervention of Europe, and without giving birth to the same hopes as the immediate conclusion of an armistice, would exercise a happy influence on the march of events. Why, therefore, should not a combination which respects all the relations of the United States obtain the approbation of the federal government. Persuaded, on our part, that it is in conformity with their true interests, we do not hesitate to recommend it to their attention; and not having sought in the project of a mediation of the maritime powers of Europe any vain display of influence, we would applaud with entire freedom from all susceptibility of self-esteem the opening of a negotiation which would invite the two populations to discuss, without the co-operation of Europe, the solution of their differences.

I request you, sir, to give this assurance to the cabinet of Washington, while commending to its wisdom counsels dictated by most sincere interest in the prosperity of the United States. You are, moreover, authorized, if Mr. Seward expresses the wish, to leave with him a copy of this dispatch.

Accept, sir, the assurance of my high consideration,
DROUYN DE LHUYS.

Mr. MERCIER,
Minister of France, at Washington.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 465.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 2, 1863.

SIR:

The mail closes without our having received the customary European dispatches. There has been some little concern arising from a disposition manifested by one or two persons to strengthen a supposed benevolent idea of French mediation in our affairs. The excitement, however,

has subsided, without any other result than a discovery that, amid all the angry partisan contentions of the day, the sense of national dignity and honor seems perfectly unimpaired.

* * * * *

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 316.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,

London, February 6, 1863.

SIR: I transmit herewith a copy of the Queen's speech, delivered through a commission to both houses of Parliament on the opening yesterday.

* * * * *

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

Secretary of State.

[For inclosure see Parliamentary and Judicial Appendix No. 10.]

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

No. 297.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, February 6, 1863.

SIR: The intimation given in your dispatch of January 15, (No. 255, that I might expect a special visit from Mr. Mercier, has been realized. He called on the third instant, and gave me a copy of a dispatch which he had just then received from Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys, under date of the 9th of January. I have taken the President's instructions, and I now proceed to give you his views upon the subject in question.

It has been considered with seriousness resulting from the reflection that the people of France are known to be faultless sharers with the American nation in the misfortunes and calamities of our unhappy civil war. Nor do we on this, any more than on other occasions, forget the traditional friendship of the two countries, which we unhesitatingly believe has inspired the counsels that Mr. Drouyn de l'Huys has imparted.

He says, "the federal government does not despair, we know, of giving more active impulse to hostilities;" and again heremarks, "the protraction of the struggle, in a word, has not shaken the confidence" (of the federal government) "in the definitive success of its efforts." These passages seem to me to do unintentional injustice to the language, whether confidential or public, in which this government has constantly spoken on the subject of the war. It certainly has had and avowed only one purpose, a determination to preserve the integrity of the country. So far from admitting any laxity of effort, or betraying any despondency, the government has, on the contrary, borne itself cheerfully in all vicissitudes, with unwavering confidence in an early and complete triumph of

the national cause. Now, when we are, in a manner, invited by a friendly power to review the twenty-one months' history of the conflict, we find no occasion to abate that confidence. Through such an alternation of victories and defeats as is the appointed incident of every war, the land and naval forces of the United States have steadily advanced, reclaiming from the insurgents the ports, forts, and posts which they had treacherously seized before the strife actually began, and even before it was seriously apprehended. So many of the States and districts which the insurgents included in the field of their projected exclusive slaveholding dominion have already been re-established under the flag of the Union, that they now retain only the States of Georgia, Alabama, and Texas, with half of Virginia, half of North Carolina, two-thirds of South Carolina, half of Mississippi, and one-third respectively of Arkansas and Louisiana. The national forces hold even this small territory in close blockade and siege.

This government, if required, does not hesitate to submit its achievements to the test of comparison, and it maintains that in no part of the world and in no times, ancient or modern, has a nation, when rendered all unready for combat by the enjoyment of eighty years of almost unbroken peace, so quickly awakened at the alarm of sedition, put forth energies so vigorous, and achieved successes so signal and effective as those which have marked the progress of this contest on the part of the Union.

Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys, I fear, has taken other light than the correspondence of this government for his guidance in ascertaining its temper and firmness. He has probably read of divisions of sentiment among those who hold themselves forth as organs of public opinion here, and has given to them an undue importance. It is to be remembered that this is a nation of thirty millions, civilly divided into forty-one States and Territories, which cover an expanse hardly less than Europe; that the people are a pure democracy, exercising everywhere the utmost freedom of speech and suffrage; that a great crisis necessarily produces vehemence as well as profound debate, with sharp collisions of individual, local, and sectional interests, sentiments, and ambitions, and that this heat of controversy is increased by the intervention of speculations, interests, prejudices, and passions from every other part of the civilized world. It is, however, through such debates that the agreement of the nation upon any subject is habitually attained, its resolutions formed, and its policy established. While there has been much difference of popular opinion and favor concerning the agents who shall carry on the war, the principles on which it shall be waged, and the means with which it shall be prosecuted, Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys has only to refer to the statute book of Congress and the executive ordinances to learn that the national activity has hitherto been, and yet is, as efficient as that of any other nation, whatever its form of government, ever was, under circumstances of equally grave import to its peace, safety, and welfare. Not one voice has been raised anywhere, out of the immediate field of the insurrection, in favor of foreign intervention, of mediation, of arbitration, or of compromise, with the relinquishment of one acre of the national domain, or the surrender of even one constitutional franchise. At the same time it is manifest to the world that our resources are yet abundant, and our credit adequate to the existing emergency.

What Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys suggests is, that this government shall appoint commissioners to meet, on neutral ground, commissioners of the insurgents. He supposes that, in the conferences to be thus held, reciprocal complaints could be discussed, and in place of the accusations which the North and the South now mutually cast upon each other, the con-

ferences would be engaged with discussions of the interests which divide them. He assumes, further, that the commissioners would seek, by means of well-ordered and profound deliberation, whether these interests are definitively irreconcilable, whether separation is an extreme that can no longer be avoided, or whether the memories of a common existence, the ties of every kind which have made of the North and the South one whole federative State, and have borne them on to so high a degree of prosperity, are not more powerful than the causes which have placed arms in the hands of the two populations.

The suggestion is not an extraordinary one, and it may well have been thought by the Emperor of the French, in the earnestness of his benevolent desire for the restoration of peace, a feasible one. But when Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys shall come to review it in the light in which it must necessarily be examined in this country, I think he can hardly fail to perceive that it amounts to nothing less than a proposition that, while this government is engaged in suppressing an armed insurrection, with the purpose of maintaining the constitutional national authority and preserving the integrity of the country, it shall enter into diplomatic discussion with the insurgents upon the questions whether that authority shall not be renounced, and whether the country shall not be delivered over to disunion, to be quickly followed by ever increasing anarchy.

If it were possible for the government of the United States to compromise the national authority so far as to enter into such debates, it is not easy to perceive what good results could be obtained from them.

The commissioners must agree in recommending either that the Union shall stand, or that it shall be voluntarily dissolved; or else they must leave the vital question unsettled, to abide at last the fortunes of the war. This government has not shut out knowledge of the present temper any more than of the past purposes of the insurgents. There is not the least ground to suppose that the controlling actors would be persuaded, at this moment, by any arguments which national commissioners could offer, to forego the ambition that has impelled them to the disloyal position they are occupying. Any commissioners who should be appointed by those actors, or through their dictation or influence, must enter the conferences imbued with the spirit and pledged to the personal fortunes of the insurgent chiefs. The loyal people in the insurrectionary States would be unheard, and any offer of peace by this government on the condition of the maintenance of the Union must necessarily be rejected.

On the other hand, as I have already intimated, this government has not the least thought of relinquishing the trust which has been confided to it by the nation, under the most solemn of all political sanctions; and if it had any such thought it would still have abundant reason to know that peace, proposed at the cost of dissolution, would be immediately, universally, and indignantly rejected by the American people. It is a great mistake that European statesmen make if they suppose this people are demoralized. Whatever, in the case of an insurrection, the people of France, or of Great Britain, or of Switzerland, or of the Netherlands, would do to save their national existence, no matter how the strife might be regarded by or might affect foreign nations, just so much, and certainly no less, the people of the United States will do, if necessary, to save, for the common benefit, the region which is bounded by the Pacific and the Atlantic coasts, and by the shores of the Gulfs of St. Lawrence and Mexico, together with the free and common navigation of the Rio Grande, Missouri, Arkansas, Mississippi, Ohio, St. Lawrence, Hudson, Delaware, Potomac, and other national highways by which this land,

which to them is at once a land of inheritance and a land of promise, is opened and watered. Even if the agents of the American people now exercising their power should, through fear or faction, fall below this height of the national virtue, they would be speedily, yet constitutionally, replaced by others of sterner character and patriotism.

I must be allowed to say, also, that Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys errs in his description of the parties to the present conflict. We have here, in a political sense, no North and South, no southern and northern States. We have an insurrectionary party, which is located chiefly upon, and adjacent to, the shore of the Gulf of Mexico, and we have, on the other hand, a loyal people who constitute not only northern States, but also eastern, middle, western, and southern States.

I have on many occasions heretofore submitted to the French government the President's views of the interests and the ideas, more effective, for the time, than even interests which lie at the bottom of the determination of the American government and people to maintain the federal Union. The President has done the same thing in his messages and other public declarations. I refrain, therefore, from reviewing that argument in connection with the existing question.

Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys draws to his aid the conferences which took place between the colonies and Great Britain in our revolutionary war. He will allow me to answer, that action in the crisis of a nation must accord with its necessities, and therefore can seldom be conformed to precedents. Great Britain, when entering on that negotiation, had manifestly come to entertain doubts of her ultimate success; and it is certain that the councils of the colonies could not fail to take new courage, if not to gain another advantage, when the parent state compromised so far as to treat of peace on the terms of conceding their independence.

It is true, indeed, that peace must come at some time, and that conferences must attend, if they are not allowed to precede, the pacification. There is, however, a better form for such conferences than the one which Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys suggests. The latter would be palpably in derogation of the Constitution of the United States, and would carry no weight, because destitute of the sanction necessary to bind either the disloyal or the loyal portions of the people. On the other hand, the Congress of the United States furnishes a constitutional forum for debates between the alienated parties. Senators and representatives from the loyal portion of the people are there already, fully empowered to confer, and seats also are vacant and inviting senators and representatives of the discontented party who may be constitutionally sent there from the States involved in the insurrection. Moreover, the conferences which can thus be held in Congress have this great advantage over any that could be organized upon the plan of Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys, namely, that the Congress, if it were thought wise, could call a national convention, to adopt its recommendations and give them all the solemnity and binding force of organic law. Such conferences between the alienated parties may be said to have already begun. Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Missouri—States which are claimed by the insurgents—are already represented in Congress, and submitting with perfect freedom, and in a proper spirit, their advice upon the course best calculated to bring about in the shortest time a firm, lasting, and honorable peace. Representatives have been sent, also, from Louisiana, and others are understood to be coming from Arkansas.

There is a preponderating argument in favor of the congressional form of conference over that which is suggested by Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys, namely, that while an accession to the latter would bring this govern-

ment into a concurrence with the insurgents in disregarding and setting aside an important part of the Constitution of the United States, and so would be of pernicious example, the congressional conference, on the contrary, preserves and gives new strength to that sacred instrument, which must continue through future ages the sheet-anchor of the republic.

You will be at liberty to read this dispatch to Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys, and to give him a copy if he shall desire it.

To the end that you may be informed of the whole case, I transmit a copy of Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys's dispatch.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 481.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, February 16, 1863.

SIR: The mails by the Asia not having reached here, I have nothing to add to the other instructions which you will receive by this post.

A copy of an instruction of this date to Mr. Dayton is, however, inclosed.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

No. 302.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, February 16, 1863.

SIR: Your confidential dispatch of January 30 (No. 263) has just been received. I did not doubt that the telegraphic account of the French proposition, which became known here on the arrival of the Europa, was made with the consent of the French government. Nor have I had any more doubt that the proposition itself was the fruit of disloyal communications from this side of the Atlantic. I think, however, that the response the country has made ought to satisfy the French government that it is safer to rely on our official and national authority than on the secret suggestion of a few unhappy partisans among us.

Persons under the influence of impatience expect greater and more immediate results from any favored measure which is adopted than can be realized. But, on the other hand, the results of judicious policies are quite sure to discomfit those who denounce and renounce them in the first moment of disappointment. We have indications here that the timid counsels which have given some encouragement to emissaries and sympathizers with secession abroad, and have seemed to threaten division and distraction at home, are encountering a reaction that promises health of public sentiment and strength to the government. I cannot allow myself to analyze this evidence, since I think it prudent to refrain in a foreign correspondence, even though a private one, from all unnecessary

allusions to the ever-changing phases of political debates at home. You will, moreover, be quite as able to do so as I am.

The Asia's mails have not arrived at the department, and the outgoing mails are now being closed.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extracts.]

No. 337.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, February 26, 1863.

SIR: I omitted last week much notice of the telegram received from you, as well as of the general news that came by the steamer respecting the alleged interruption of the blockade at Charleston, for the reason that the fiction made no impression whatever on public opinion in this country. A little more success has attended a similar attempt yesterday to create a belief of a serious misunderstanding between Mr. Mercier and yourself. The wish for French intervention is father to the thought. And it is the more cherished by malevolent parties, since the course of opinion here renders the probability less of any such action on this side.

In the mean time, however, the favorable interval should be improved by the military action in America. This is all that is needed to protect us from the possibility of European intervention. I regret to be obliged to confess that thus far the results have not corresponded to expectation. Cases of decided success grow less rather than more frequent, and public confidence in the direction of the war has declined. Were it not for this, I can confidently affirm that by this time few vestiges of sympathy with the rebels would remain outside of interested commercial circles in any part of this kingdom.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

No. 277.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, February 26, 1863.

SIR: Your dispatch No 297 was received by me on the 24th instant. It was immediately copied, and yesterday read to Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys, the copy, at his request, being left with him. He listened attentively to its reading, and at the close said that his suggestion to our government had been made in a kind spirit, and he believed the reply to be in a like spirit; that he was not disposed to make the reply or its suggestions the subject of debate or argument; that he did not know, I think he added, if he had any right to do so. He said that he would read again the copy of the dispatch left with him, and consider it more carefully than he could from having heard it once read only. There was nothing

in the manner of Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys to indicate that he was disappointed in the result. I should add, however, that he had already been apprised of it by a short communication from Mr. Mercier. He said Mr. Mercier had informed him by a brief note that you would give a negative answer, but in all respects a kind one. This I told him you had done, and called his attention to the prefatory remarks in your dispatch as an evidence of the spirit and kind feeling in which his suggestion had been received by our government.

The conversation closed without any intimation from Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys of further or ulterior purposes upon the part of this government. I could not, for obvious reasons, assume to question him as to whether such purposes did or did not exist.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 292.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, March 27, 1863.

SIR: * * * * * * *

I yesterday communicated to Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys the "concurrent resolutions of Congress concerning foreign intervention in the existing rebellion." He did not desire me to read them, but preferred that I should leave a copy, which I did. He said he had already seen them, they having been immediately communicated to his department through Mr. Mercier. He made no remarks concerning them, and evidently was not disposed to go into any conversation on the subject. His mind seemed to be preoccupied with Poland and its complications. He avoided, intentionally, as I thought, conversation as to our affairs. He merely said that things seemed ripe there for some important movements, and he supposed we would soon have news of interest from our country.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 356.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, March 27, 1863.

SIR: * * * * * * *

Having disposed of this matter, I next turned to the subject of the joint resolutions of Congress on foreign intervention, and agreeably to your instructions contained in the printed circular of the 9th March I offered to read them to his lordship, or to leave a copy, as he might

prefer. He said that Lord Lyons had already sent a copy of them, which he had read. His opinion on that subject was sufficiently known. He would therefore take a copy, which I accordingly put into his hands.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extracts.]

No. 547.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 10, 1863.

SIR: Your dispatch of March 20 (No. 353) has been received. * * *

It has not been gratifying to this government to see that consultations concerning our internal affairs have been held by representatives of foreign powers with citizens of the United States who dissented from the policy of the President. * * * But, on the other hand, the greater responsibility for the improper communications manifestly rested with the citizens who encouraged and probably sought the illicit intercourse. The discontented state of the public mind at the moment when our suspicions were aroused made it seem inexpedient then to institute proceedings against those citizens. It would not have been magnanimous to complain of the compromised foreigner and leave the conspiring citizens unrebuked.

Fortunately, the injurious proceeding culminated in the propositions of Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys. The necessity for answering that communication furnished the occasion equally to show the determination of the government and to elicit the sentiments of the people in regard to every form of foreign intervention and intrigue. The result has been so entirely satisfactory as to enable the President to overlook, as merely harmless incidents in our great struggle, the injurious consultations to which I have alluded, and to leave the parties to them to the all-sufficient censure of public opinion throughout the world.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 027.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 15, 1863.

SIR: * * * * *

Intervention or even recognition of the insurgents by foreign nations must in any case be expected to result in a foreign war, more or less wide and universally dangerous. Knowing that owing to the doubts and difficulties which attend the military and naval operations, foreign nations are continually tempted to offensive intervention or interference, we have

come to contemplate the aggravation of external war as always possible, and at no time improbable. When it shall come, if it must come, it ought to find us armed with the plea that we have neither made it, nor readily or unwisely provoked it. We think that we can better afford to err on the side of prudence than incur the responsibility of a disastrous complication that with reasonable moderation could be avoided.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 438.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, June 26, 1863.

SIR :

The question proposed by Mr. Roebuck, as a test of the sense of the House of Commons on America, is assigned for the 30th instant. I understand it is yet to be modified, so as to fit the supposed minimum of resistance that can be applied to it. In the meanwhile Messrs. Roebuck and Lindsay are reported to have been to Paris, acting in the capacity of self-appointed negotiators for the co-operation of the Emperor of the French, and to have obtained some sort of favorable expression of sentiment from him. This is a new species of influence to bring to bear in England with any hope of success.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 439.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, June 26, 1863.

SIR: I feel it my duty to inform you that I yesterday learned from a good source that Baron Gros, the French ambassador at this court, expressed it as his individual opinion that the Emperor would soon renew his proposition to the British government to recognize the rebel authorities, and in case the ministry should decline to move, he would then proceed alone. At the same time he took care to disclaim speaking from authority or any positive knowledge. I have this from a person entirely trustworthy.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward

[Extract.]

No. 441.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, July 1, 1863.

SIR: I transmit, out of the ordinary course, a report* of the proceedings in the House of Commons last night, on the motion made by Mr. Roebuck. It is difficult to imagine a more awkward situation than that in which he has succeeded in placing as well his own government as the Emperor of the French.

A painful sense of this is marked in the leader in this morning's Times on the subject. The struggle between inclination and prudence is singularly betrayed in the admission that the speech was heard by the House with *pleasure*. The debate will probably be resumed on Thursday.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

HON. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 323.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, July 2, 1863.

SIR: I have communicated to Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys to-day the substance of your dispatch No. 357.

I then called his attention to the statements of Mr. Roebuck, in the British Parliament, made yesterday, as to the views and wishes of the Emperor in reference to the recognition of the South. He expressed much regret that Mr. Roebuck should have made statements of what must have been at best an unofficial and private conversation; and, as to those parts of the statement in which he says the Emperor authorized him to communicate his views on this subject to the House of Commons, he said it could not be so; such a proceeding would have been so irregular that it was not possible for him to suppose that the statement of Mr. Roebuck could have originated otherwise than in a misunderstanding or mistake; that, in point of fact, *no official communication of any kind* has recently passed, on this subject, between France and England. He said that it was not improbable that the Emperor had stated, in the course of conversation, that his views on the subjects remained unchanged, and that he wished to act in concert with England in reference to American affairs; but he was satisfied that he had suggested nothing and proposed nothing to be communicated to the British government. I told Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys that I assumed no right to inquire as to the private conversations of the Emperor, but here was a case in which it was said the Emperor had authorized two members of the British Parliament to make statements in that chamber for the purpose of influencing its policy against

* For inclosure see Parliamentary and Judicial Appendix, No. 26.

the United States; that under such circumstances (if true) the communication on the part of the Emperor assumed a quasi official character, and it was, therefore, the fair subject of inquiry and explanation. To this he assented, and said it was not possible for him to speak of the exact words of a conversation at which he was not himself present, but he was satisfied it could not have been as represented. He said, further, that the statement of Mr. Roebuck seemed to him contradictory in itself, and we know that part of it in which the Emperor is made to complain of ill treatment at the hands of Earl Russell, in exposing his dispatch of last year to you, must in some way be untrue or absurd. The contents of that dispatch, you will recollect, were communicated to me by the French government, and by me to you before it was in any way made public, and the dispatch itself was immediately afterwards printed in the *Moniteur*. It is preposterous to suppose that his Majesty could have complained that the British government had committed a breach of confidence in communicating to you what it had already formally communicated to me. * * * It may not be amiss that I should state that the Emperor himself, since the visit of Messrs. Lindsay and Roebuck, has said explicitly that he had given no authority to those gentlemen to propose any thing, or in any way to represent his views to the British government. It is difficult to understand how these discrepancies can be accounted for.

Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys, before closing the conversation, repeated his often expressed wish for the termination of our war, and said he would be glad if England could suggest some mode by which it might be brought about; but for himself he could see nothing which would be available for that purpose. I took occasion again to assure him that it certainly would not be brought to a close by a *recognition* of the South; that such an act might extend and enlarge the war by drawing other nations into it, but it would have no effect on the United States except to exasperate the North and excite it to increased exertions. To this he made no reply.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

N. B.—Inclosed is the extract* from Mr. Roebuck's speech.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

Extract.]

No. 446.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, July 3, 1863.

SIR: The effect of Tuesday night's debate was very severe on Mr. Roebuck, who seems to have lost by it the remnant of political consideration which he once enjoyed. His extraordinary attempt to influence the action of the house by the use of the authority of the Emperor of the French, as well as his presuming to make himself the medium of an appeal to Parliament against the conduct of the ministry, have had the consequences which might naturally be expected by any one acquainted with the English character. Thus it happened that Mr. Roebuck, though addressing an assembly a great portion of whom sympa-

* For inclosure see Parliamentary and Judicial Appendix, No. 26.

thized with him in his object, demolished his cause, whilst on the other hand, Mr. Bright, even whilst running counter to the predisposition of most of his hearers, succeeded in extorting a general tribute of admiration of his eloquent and convincing reply.

But though the fate of Mr. Roebuck's motion was sealed by the course of the debate of that evening, it is not to be inferred that there is not a steady increase of the disposition in high quarters to take some action or other in favor of the rebels. This is much stimulated by the assiduous labors of the rebel emissaries to produce a belief in the existence of a great diversion of opinion among us, as to the propriety of continuing the war. It is argued that some action on this side would now have an effect to diminish all hopes of success in restoration, and to a corresponding extent to make the advocates of peace, who would gladly welcome such assistance, to preponderate. The only effective answer to such a course of reasoning, applied to minds predisposed to conviction, is success in the war. And that is, I am sorry to say, as yet denied us. Precisely at this moment comes the intelligence of aggressive movements of the rebel army, which bear the look of power not met by corresponding ability to resist them. It is true that the first aspect of this news was not viewed with favor, because it was thought to be likely to revive the war spirit and reunite opinion. The growing hope is, however, that a stroke may be effected which will be so decisive as to render some operation on this side more natural and effective presently than it can be just now.

The debate was last evening adjourned over to a week from Monday, evidently for the purpose of awaiting events. But it seems now to be the general opinion that the government will not give facilities to a renewal of it at so late a period of the session, unless the circumstances should have essentially become changed in the interval. The conflicting testimony in regard to the Emperor's course is made even more inexplicable by the declaration last night of Mr. Layard.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 647.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 9, 1863.

SIR: I transmit herewith for your information a copy of an instruction, which I yesterday addressed to Mr. Dayton, upon the subject of intervention in the affairs of the United States.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

No. 368.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 8, 1863.

SIR: Your dispatch of June 22, No. 317, has been received. So much of it as relates to international postal arrangements has been communicated to the Postmaster General.

Fresh rumors of imperial sympathy with the insurgents of this country, and of intentions of the cabinet at Fontainebleau to renew its propositions for moral action of European governments in our domestic affairs preceded the arrival of your dispatch, and now borrow a certain measure of confirmation from it. Whatever truth there may be in these reports, it is morally certain that they are promulgated, not by the French government, but by emissaries of the insurgents in Europe, for the purpose of producing the intervention they threaten us with. The rumors may, therefore, be received with much allowance. The government of the United States, with unanimity unprecedented in its councils, has already, inoffensively, and with becoming respect, made known to the Emperor of the French that any new demonstration of activity by him prejudicial to the unity of the American people will be necessarily regarded as unfriendly, and will produce a strain upon the fraternal bonds that have so long united the two countries. We should profoundly regret a proceeding that would be followed by such a consequence. We cannot think so unkindly of the Emperor of the French as to believe that his recent success in Mexico would influence his judgment upon a question so entirely independent of the merits of his war against that republic, and at the same time so profoundly interesting to the United States. If his impartial judgment could, indeed, be swerved by such accidents as the capture of Puebla and Mexico, we should then be entitled to believe that it would return to its first policy when he shall have received intelligence of the defeat that our insurgents have recently sustained in Pennsylvania, and the even more significant event of the surrender of Vicksburg, which has just taken place.

The question recurs, however, what are you to do in view of these new alarms? I am authorized to reply that you will not be expected to seek beforehand to penetrate the Imperial determination, or to manifest any anxiety concerning it. If the Emperor shall, by any official act, violate the sovereignty which you represent, your functions will be suspended. If he shall go further than to propose, either separately or in conjunction with any other power, to again address the United States concerning their affairs, you will inform Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys that you have good reason to expect that they will not in any case be induced to depart from the course they have so distinctly indicated in regard to foreign intervention.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 448.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, July 9, 1863.

SIR: I have to acknowledge the reception of dispatches from the department, numbered from 629 to 634, inclusive, and of a telegram, in cipher, relating to the intercepted correspondence, desired by Mr. Dudley. I learn from him, however, that the original letters, being the only papers that could be of any use in the trial, did not come after all.

No material change has taken place in the condition of things here. Lord Palmerston has recovered sufficiently from his illness to appear in the House, and on Monday he consented to an assignment of Monday next for the continuance of the discussion on Mr. Roebuck's motion.

There is as yet no explanation of the divergency between the statements made by him, and corroborated by Mr. Lindsay, and those authorized by the Emperor of the French. Mr. Roebuck's advocacy of the rebel cause has done it no good. At the same time, it is not advisable to misconceive the nature of the prevailing sentiment in Parliament and in the higher classes, which only awaits a favorable occasion to find expression. I now learn that the latest accounts from America of the apathy of the population of the middle States in resisting the movements of General Lee are hailed as symptoms of the proximate surrender of the United States at discretion. We have heretofore had, during the course of this war, a capitulation of General McClellan, with his army, and one of General Hooker, with his force, but it seems that now comes the turn of the government and people. These are worthy of notice only as indications how much the wish is father to the thought in English society.

The turn which the debate may take on Monday night will depend very much on the news that will be received on Saturday. If it be of a kind to encourage the expression of what is really felt, I shall not be surprised to find it very offensive in some quarters. The opposition leaders are generally disinclined to any demonstrations whatever. Several of them, in reality, rather sympathize with us. But the body of their party continue animated by the same feelings to America which brought on the revolution, and which drove us into the war of 1812. Mr. Roebuck gave expression to them in a manner which rather alarmed the timid, who prefer not to commit themselves to what they have a lurking conviction not to be exactly creditable to the nation. He is, however, entitled to consideration for his honesty and frankness. It is, perhaps, as well for the two countries that there should be no want of evidence on the record to establish the facts as they really are for all future time. I know not where we should be able to look for more forcible arguments in favor of a permanent Union, for the preservation of the requisite means to defend ourselves against the efforts of such palpable malevolence.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 649.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 10, 1863.

SIR: I transmit herewith for your information a copy of a * * * instruction, which I have this day addressed to Mr. Dayton, relative to French intervention in our civil war.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

No. 369.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 10, 1863.

SIR: In a confidential communication which was written at London, on the 26th of May, by a responsible person, who is most unlikely to be misinformed or to be misled concerning any fact which he accepts, I have a statement to the effect that Baron Gros, the French ambassador at the court of Great Britain, has recently expressed it as his individual opinion that the Emperor of the French would soon renew his proposition to the British government to recognize the rebel authorities, (in the United States,) and in case the ministry should decline to move, he would then proceed alone. At the same time the ambassador took care to disclaim speaking from authority or any positive knowledge.

The person who will deliver you this communication is authorized to give you the name of my correspondent for your own better satisfaction, and to be used by you if, in view of all the circumstances existing at Paris, when this dispatch shall reach you, it shall seem either necessary or expedient.

I will not repeat here the reasons I have heretofore communicated to you for distrusting reports of injurious designs on the part of the Emperor. I have still less occasion to repeat that such a design as is attributed to his Majesty will be deemed unfriendly by this government. I may, however, properly state what I wrote in my last dispatch, that the condition of military affairs here is such as to warrant a belief that, even if his Majesty has entertained such a design, he would relinquish it when that condition shall become known to him. I now add to this statement, that, after hearing the news of the defeat of the insurgents at Gettysburg, and the surrender of Vicksburg, Mr. Mercier called upon me and congratulated me upon the events, and declared without reserve that he regarded these disasters as fatal to the insurrection. He tendered me his good offices to the extent of suggesting to his government that they should cause the insurgents to understand that they could no longer look to it for recognition, saying that such a suggestion was due to them, as well as to the United States, upon considerations of friendship and humanity. I did not accept the overture, although I thanked him cordially for making it. My only reason for waiving it was that an acceptance might possibly be construed into a willingness to invoke foreign influence in our domestic conflict; that the remarks attributed by my informant to the French ambassador at London are deemed too important to this country to be overlooked by this government, while they justify us in asking Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys for an explanation of the policy of the Emperor in regard to the civil war existing in the United States. You will, however, not regard the instruction as peremptory, if, in your judgment, formed upon better knowledge than we can have here of the dispositions of the French government, it shall be inexpedient to agitate the subject. You will also consult your own discretion as to the manner of asking the explanation, it being possible that it will be best to take a course informal and confidential. You may, if you think it best, solicit the explanation with reference to its influence upon your own position and movements, or you may intimate that this government desires it in order to determine its own course of proceedings, in view of the policy that the Emperor's government may be about to adopt.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 650.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 11, 1863.

SIR: I transmit herewith, for your further information on the subject, a copy of a dispatch of the 26th ultimo, No. 321, which I have just received from Mr. Dayton, relative to intervention or recognition of the insurgents against the government of the United States, together with a copy of my reply of this date.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

No. 321.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, June 26, 1863.

SIR: I herewith inclose you the translation of a communication in *La France*, and copy of the paper itself; this journal having, it is supposed by the diplomatic corps, a certain indirect connection with the government. As the substance of this communication was in conformity with information reported to me from other sources, I felt justified, yesterday, in asking Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys distinctly if any change in the policy of this government towards us was contemplated, whether anything was in agitation. He said first that he knew of nothing, but added that he had not seen the Emperor for some days, and he could not therefore answer for what he had said or done. He informed me, however, that he was satisfied that the Emperor had seen Mr. Slidell here, and he believed that he had seen Messrs. Lindsay and Roebuck at Fontainebleau, but of the latter fact he did not speak with certainty. I have, however, no doubt of it, nor have I any doubt that their mission to Fontainebleau was to get directly from the Emperor the expression of his views with a view to its influence in the British Parliament. I have heard it said that the conference with Mr. Slidell was mainly in reference to the policy of the confederate government in regard to the French invasion of Mexico, and its probable conduct towards them if they should wish to make the South a basis of operations against that country, upon all of which Mr. Slidell of course gave, it is said, most satisfactory assurances. This Mexican question has become a most prominent one in the policy of the Emperor, and the more his invasion of that country is complained of, the more anxious does he seem as to its success. Notwithstanding that professions of friendship and good feeling are so constantly made on the part of this government, I am constrained to say (as I have heretofore substantially said) that I am always somewhat distrustful of them. I should have confidence in what Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys says to me of the policy of France, if he commanded the situation, but he does not. There is a self-judging, governing, and reticent power behind him. I sometimes fear that we have gone so long and escaped so far all foreign interference, that we underrate its probable danger. I do not mean the danger of an actual forcible interference, but the danger of a recognition of the independence of the South. This recognition these foreign governments do not believe would be just cause of war, nor that it would lead to it.

I take it for granted that, as we have heard nothing to the contrary, the instructions given to Mr. Adams, (a copy of which was sent to me,) as to the conduct to be adopted by us in the event of recognition, remain yet the expression of the wishes and directions of the government. Please let me hear from you upon this subject.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

[Extract from the journal *La France*.—Translation.]

"We understand that Mr. Slidell, envoy of the Confederate States, was received on Thursday last by the Emperor, during the short stay that his Majesty made at Paris.

"We have reason to believe that the visit of Mr. Slidell was connected with the idea of recognizing the Confederate States of the South, and of thus giving new force to the peace party, which is increasing every day in the States of the North.

"The sympathies of the South for France have just been manifested in a striking manner. Richmond has been illuminated upon the occasion of the capture of Puebla, while this great feat of arms was received at the North with an undissembled feeling of regret. We are informed also that Messrs. Roebuck and Lindsay, members of the British Parliament, have had the honor of being received by his Majesty the Emperor.

"It is known that these honorable deputies have presented a motion in Parliament, which ought to be discussed next week, and which has for its object the recognition of the southern States.

"The cause of the confederates gains new sympathies every day, and their heroic resistance on the one side, on the other the impotence of the armies of the North, prove that there is in them a people strongly organized, worthy, in fine, to be admitted among the independent states.

"We are assured that Spain in particular will show herself disposed to recognize the South upon the condition, easy to be arranged, that the new confederation would recognize in its turn the secular rights of the Spanish government over the island of Cuba, and would interdict itself from all aggression against this island.

"A. RENAULD."

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

No. 370.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 11, 1863.

SIR: Your dispatch of June 26 (No. 321) has just come to my hands, but not until after I had dispatched Mr. Cox with a communication, which in a great measure anticipated the information you have now given to me, and the inquiry you have propounded to me.

Never more than now have we experienced so fully the political inconvenience and hazards which result from a want of telegraphic communication. On the European shore the public mind is filled with complaints of the impotence of the armies of the United States. On our side the great and brilliant victories recently won by those armies are celebrated as assuring a complete and speedy extinguishment of the insurrection.

You will accept the President's thanks for the vigilance with which you have watched political movements in France, and you will, in the event of any proceedings of intervention or recognition, adhere to and follow the instructions upon that subject heretofore given.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 452.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, July 16, 1863.

SIR: *

The only event of interest during the week has been the final withdrawal of his motion by Mr. Roebuck. I transmit a report of the debate of Monday evening. The part taken in it by Mr. Lindsay will not escape your attention, and, more especially, the allusions to a correspondent at Paris, through whom the conference with the Emperor was obtained.

The subject is disposed of for the present session of Parliament, unless revived by some extraordinary course from without. The present impression is, that the prorogation will take place about the 28th instant, in which case little more business will be done after this week.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

[For debate above referred to see Parliamentary and Judicial Appendix, No. 27.]

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

[Extract.]

No. 374.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 17, 1863.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the reception of your dispatch of the 2d of July, (No. 323,) in which you have related a conversation which you have just before held with Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys upon several subjects affecting our relations with France.

I have submitted to the President Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys's observations concerning the reported conversation held between his Majesty and Messrs. Roebuck and Lindsay, at Fontainebleau. I am allowed the pleasure of approving your proceeding and observations relating to that subject; also to say that Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys's replies harmonize with the views of the imperial conversation which I had taken when the contradictory and irreconcilable accounts of it reached me. I did not doubt that the remarks of the Emperor, whatever they were, were

casual, unstudied, and informal utterances, not intended or expected to be made the basis of diplomatic movements or proceedings in England or elsewhere, and at the same time complaisantly, in some degree, accommodated to the taste and temper of his visitors. You were altogether right in correcting the strange misapprehension which assumed that the British government had disloyally shown to me confidential dispatches of Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys. The moment I saw that statement I caused a correction of it to be published, of which I send you a copy, to be communicated to Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys. I have read in the *Moniteur* what is understood to be an authorized explanation by the Emperor of his aforementioned conversation. The statement relieves it of some points that could not but excite sensibility in the United States. But there yet remains in the transaction evidence of misapprehension, on the part of his Majesty, concerning the civil war in the United States, which this government perceives with regret, and not without surprise, in view of the perfectly direct and frank expressions which, under the directions of the President, you have heretofore given to the Emperor's minister for foreign affairs. I reserve further discussion of the subject, however, until I shall have learned the final proceedings of the British government upon the motion instituted in the House of Commons by Mr. Roebuck, with which proceedings those of the Emperor are so singularly connected.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq. &c., &c., &c.

CORRECTION.

WASHINGTON, July 15, 1863.

The Secretary of State authorizes a correction of the statement made in the British Parliament that the British government showed to him the communication, made last winter by the French government to the British government, on the subject of mediation in the United States. The first knowledge which the government of the United States had of the French proposition was received from the French government itself.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 656.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, July 18, 1863.

SIR: Your dispatch of July 1 (No. 441) has been received, together with the report of the debate which occurred on the 30th of June in the House of Commons on the motion of Mr. Roebuck for proceedings hostile to the United States.

I perceive that the discussion was adjourned to the 9th instant. I shall therefore defer consideration of it until we shall have learned here the answer which the government of Great Britain has given to Mr. Roebuck's proposition.

Meantime, however, I must not omit to say that I lost no time in putting forth a correction of the statement that her Majesty's government had abused the Emperor's confidence by putting into my hands a printed

communication of Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys. A copy of that publication* accompanies this dispatch.

If it seems possible to draw consolation for errors of our own citizens from parallel mistakes committed by subjects of other powers, I might remark with some satisfaction that the irregular diplomacy of some Americans sojourning in Europe compares not unfavorably with the achievements of Mr. Roebuck, as a voluntary negotiator between her Majesty's government and that of France.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

[Extracts.]

No. 329.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, July 30, 1863.

SIR: Your messenger, Mr. Cox, arrived in Paris on Saturday night last with your dispatches Nos. 368 and 369.

Upon careful examination of their contents, I found that I had, in a great measure, anticipated your instructions, and communicated to you the result in my dispatch of July 2d, No. 323. Indeed, upon reading that dispatch to Mr. Cox, he said at once that had it been received before he left the country you would not, probably, have sent him to Europe. After consulting with him, I deemed it most prudent, especially in view of the late favorable news from the United States, not to make a formal application to Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys for a special interview in reference to the subject-matter of your dispatch, but to wait until his regular reception day, and then, in connection with other business at the Foreign Office, introduce the subject incidentally. This I have done.

* * * * *

I then called his attention to the fact that the journals of our country were now largely commenting upon the position and purposes of the Emperor in reference to the acknowledgment of the independence of the South, and that certain matters in connection with the conversation between the Emperor and Messrs. Roebuck and Lindsay, as reported by them, were calculated to induce a belief that the Emperor wished to acknowledge the South, and was held back by England only. I further stated that it had been reported, from most reliable sources, that Baron Gros had said the Emperor would make another proposition to England to act with him in acknowledging the South, and if she would not do it, he would act alone. That these matters were calculated to create unpleasant feeling in the United States towards the imperial government, and, if not true, I thought it desirable for the interests of both countries that they be corrected. I furthermore asked him distinctly what was the *policy* of the Emperor in reference to the South. You will observe that in this way I reached the subject-matter without saying I had had any formal instructions from my government to interrogate France on these questions. The answer of Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys was, in substance, as follows: He said that the Emperor had at no time made any proposition to England to acknowledge the South. That when Messrs. Roebuck

* See the preceding communication.

and Lindsay came over they pressed him hard to do so. They said *England was ready to acknowledge the South, and would do so if it were not believed that France would refuse to follow.* That if he would but say the word, their proposition for acknowledgment (then pending in the House of Commons) would pass at once. He answered that he had given England no cause to believe he would not act with her; that the only proposition as to any action in our affairs had been made by him to England, and been rejected by her. They then urged that he should make the proposition for acknowledgment to England, which he declined to do. They then asked if they might communicate his views. He answered to this, merely, that his views on the subject were no secret; but Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys says he never dreamed of their attempting to use them, as they afterwards did, in the House of Commons. He furthermore told them that *he would not act alone upon any important matters, either on the continent or in America, and more especially would he not act alone in our affairs.*

As to the remarks attributed to Baron Gros, he would scarcely permit me to finish the statement of what they were. He began shaking his head as I went on, and, at the close, promptly said, Baron Gros never made such remarks. He had never said anything of the kind, official or unofficial, public or private, as if knowing the views of the baron on this question. He disclaimed the statement for him in the most positive and explicit manner.

In answer to my question as to the policy of the Emperor in reference to the South, he said "he had none; he waited on events." This, you may remember, I long since apprised you was, in my judgment, what he was doing, but I confess I began to fear that, unless events mended, he might think that he had waited about long enough.

After some other remarks and questions by Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys as to our recent successes, (the importance of which, especially that at Vicksburg, he seemed fully to appreciate,) our conversation closed.

I commit this dispatch to Mr. Cox, though it will not, perhaps, reach you in that way quite as early as by our ordinary means of conveyance.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 333.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, August 5, 1863.

SIR: Your dispatch No. 374 refers, among other things, to the formal correction, authorized by you, of the statement made by Mr. Roebuck, in the House of Commons, that the Emperor complained of the British government having disloyally communicated to you a confidential dispatch of the French government.

I read your statement to Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys, although it was scarcely necessary. We had heretofore talked the matter over, and the misstatement of Mr. Roebuck was well understood. What rendered this statement of that gentleman the more extraordinary is the fact that, after the most

diligent search, no other dispatch, as Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys informs me, can be found in the foreign office of this government to which his statement can possibly apply. And Mr. Layard, you will recollect, made a like statement as to the files in the British Foreign Office. Take it all in all, it was the most futile and abortive attempt to help on the recognition of the South that men in prominent position ever made. Still, that exposé in the *Moniteur*, to which you refer, while denying much of the statement made by these gentlemen, admits the readiness of the Emperor to follow England, if England believes that such acknowledgment of the South would end the war.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 676.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, August 10, 1863.

SIR: Your dispatch of the 23d of July (No. 456) was duly received. Your comments upon the condition of public sentiment in Great Britain would, if published, find an universal response in this country. But whither is the animosity against the United States which inspires a class of Englishmen leading England? They have, indeed, been gratified with seeing the prestige of this country at least for a time abridged. But has England yet gained a square mile of territory, or has she extended or augmented her great influence a hair's breadth, through the humiliation we have brought upon ourselves by the divisions which Englishmen seek to perpetuate and widen? Spain occupies a province which perhaps she might not have claimed if our country had remained at peace; and France has sent a column to Mexico since the United States became embarrassed by civil war. But England has no part in these European acquisitions on this continent. Has the voice of England become more commanding in Western Europe, or in China, or Japan since she has been made to appear an enemy of the United States? I think that it is not on her word that the peace of the world is supposed to be depending. What, indeed, is the American quarrel, which already divides the voices though not yet the votes of England, but a civil war in the universal commonwealth of the British races. Great Britain has not yet been actively concerned by American dissensions, but if we might discuss her policy as freely as her statesmen discuss our own, I think I might safely say that she does not feel a surer confidence in preserving the integrity of her great empire than we do in maintaining unbroken the large but more compact and productive one which has been committed to our care. The people of Great Britain thought more dispassionately and acted more wisely in cultivating the friendship of the United States three years ago than they do now in crowding upon the line where prejudice rises into alienation. We must, nevertheless, accept the actual situation. Perhaps it is appointed for needful discipline to both branches of the British family. When that discipline shall have been fully realized, the records of your legation will show that it was not the United States which in this instance misunderstood the interests of the great race, or were unfaithful to the

instincts which should have preserved them in full force for the benefits of civilization.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

No. 334.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,

Paris, August 20, 1863.

SIR: I read to Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys to-day your dispatch No. 380, expressing the sentiment of the President in reference to the explanation in the *Moniteur* of the views and purposes of the Emperor in respect to the South, and his conversation with Messrs. Roebuck and Lindsay.

I furthermore reminded Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys of the fact that your dispatch, which stated that our government would consider the acknowledgement of the South as an unfriendly act, was but the re-assertion of that which had been said to him before. In answer, he said that any discussion of this subject was now "*academic*" only, leading to nothing practical; but that he would submit the contents of your dispatch to the Emperor. For this purpose I left with him, at his request, a copy.

Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys took occasion again to say that he much regretted that that private conversation had been made public. I told him that I feared the effect had been to occasion an unpleasant distrust among my countrymen as to the feelings and purposes of his Majesty, and that this publication in the *Moniteur* was calculated not to diminish, but to strengthen that distrust. I told him it looked very much as if the Emperor were prompting Great Britain to acknowledge the South, by suggesting that France would follow; it was a sort of informal offer of alliance for a purpose unfriendly to us. He said that this was not, in fact, so, though the explanation in the *Moniteur* might possibly bear such a construction; but he said the Emperor had been answering Mr. Roebuck's averment that England would not acknowledge the confederates because she feared France would not follow. His intended answer was, in substance: England has no right to say so, because my proposition for mediation is all that has been done, and that was declined by her. He meant, in what he said, to imply that each country should bear its own burdens. But Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys then added, this all grows out of the wrongful publication of a mere private, unofficial conversation. There is no doubt, said he, that in such conversation the Emperor would, through a natural courtesy, rather lean towards the views or prepossessions of the parties with whom he was talking, and when it became necessary for him to explain in the *Moniteur* what the conversation actually was, "he would not falsify." But, said Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys, if propositions had been made in an official shape, calling for action, he would probably have been more guarded, and given to them a different, or, at least, more grave consideration; he might have said no, these things demanded reflection.

The above is the substance of the conversation on this point, although more passed, but nothing of an importance demanding or justifying my reducing it to writing in the form of a dispatch.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 483.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, August 27, 1863.

SIR: On a close examination of your dispatch No. 667, of the 29th July, I discovered not a little difficulty in executing the duty there imposed upon me.

The note to Lord Russell, a copy of which is transmitted, was the result of my most careful reflection. I trust that it may be considered to have answered the purpose.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Lord Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, August 22, 1863.

MY LORD: I have the honor to communicate to your lordship, under instructions from my government, a copy of a note addressed to Mr. Dayton, the minister of the United States at Paris, by the Secretary of State. I am directed to say that this is done solely out of respect to her Majesty's government, and for its information, and not from any belief that it has had any purpose or desire to vary from the policy hitherto marked out for itself in regard to the difficulties in the United States. The peculiar circumstances attending the exposition of the views of the Emperor of the French, as made in Parliament during its late session, seem to render it no more than a duty on the part of the President to communicate his opinion that the recent military and naval operations of the United States justify an augmented confidence that the insurrection, if it do not receive new and extensive aid from abroad, must fail. Hence the appearance of an intention to tender such aid, at this moment, could not but be regarded as more likely to increase existing difficulties than to overcome them. Not doubting that this is also the conviction which continues to regulate the action of her Majesty's government, I pray your lordship to accept the assurances of the highest consideration with which I have the honor to be, my lord, your most obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

No. 380.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 20, 1863.

SIR: Your dispatch of the 17th of July, No. 326, has been received.

The Minute of the 5th of July contained what is understood to be an authorized exposition of the views of the Emperor of the French in regard to the civil war now prevailing in the United States, which, for the sake of accuracy, I append.

32 A C—VOL. I

In this exposition his Majesty is represented as saying that he has determined to give the British cabinet to understand that if Great Britain should think that a recognition of the insurgents would be likely to put an end to the war he would be disposed to follow her in that course.

The President has read this announcement with surprise and regret. The Emperor has not been left by this government in doubt upon the point that a recognition of the insurgents would be regarded by it as an unfriendly proceeding. The President does not at all believe that her Majesty would adopt such a measure without first bestowing a careful consideration upon the circumstances in which it is to be executed. It is, therefore, your duty to make known to the French government that, in the President's opinion, such an examination would result in a conviction that our civil war owes the length and severity it has already attained mainly to foreign influences and aid. It is the opinion of the United States that a recognition of the insurgents by any of the great powers would bring with it only new complications and aggravations.

You will read this dispatch to Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys, and give him a copy, if it shall be desired.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Roebuck and the French Emperor.

The Paris Moniteur of the 5th instant contained the following in reference to Mr. Roebuck's late visit to the Emperor:

"Explanations have been rendered necessary by an occurrence which recently took place in the House of Commons. Messrs. Roebuck and Lindsay visited Fontainebleau to engage the Emperor to take official steps at London for the recognition of the southern States. The Emperor expressed his desire to see peace restored in America, but observed that England having declined his proposals of mediation the previous October, he did not think he could submit a new proposition without the certainty of its acceptance.

"His Majesty stated further that his ambassador should, nevertheless, receive instructions to sound the English cabinet upon the subject, giving it to understand that if England thought the recognition of the South likely to put an end to the war, the Emperor was disposed to follow her in that course. These explanations will demonstrate that the Emperor has not attempted (as certain publications pretend) to influence the British Parliament by the medium of two of its members. All that took place was a friendly interchange of opinion in an interview which the Emperor saw no reason to refuse."

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 487.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, September 3, 1863.

SIR: Lord Russell has acknowledged the reception of my note to him of the 22d ultimo, transmitting a copy of your dispatch No. 380 to Mr. Dayton, in a note of the 28th ultimo, a copy of which is transmitted.

A copy of mine to which it is in answer was sent with my dispatch No. 483, of the 27th of August.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, August 28, 1863.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 22d instant, inclosing a copy of a note addressed by Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton, the United States minister at Paris.

As you state that this communication is made solely out of respect to her Majesty's government and for its information, I have only to say that I accept it in the same spirit, and shall not deem it necessary to enter into any remarks on the dispatch to Mr. Dayton, a copy of which is inclosed in your letter.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys to Mr. Mercier.

[Translation.]

No. 21.] MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS, DIPLOMATIC DIVISION,
Paris, September 15, 1863.

SIR: Mr. Dayton, who exhibits in his relations with me a great confidence, and a rectitude to which I am pleased to bear testimony, has been moved at certain rumors, propagated with a design which I have not now to inquire into, but which appear lately to have obtained some credit at Paris, and he has come to converse with me about them. According to these reports, too inconsiderately accepted, the Emperor's government has decided to recognize the States of the South, and a treaty has even been already signed, according to which the new confederacy is to cede to France, either for herself, or that she may make a retrocession of them to Mexico, Texas, and a portion of Louisiana.

At the moment in which Mr. Dayton was imparting to me this information, I was exactly in a position to offer him information for information, and, before answering the questions which he addressed me, I asked him if, among the alarming symptoms for the maintenance of the good relations of the two countries, he had not, like myself, received other news, likewise diffused in public, such as, for instance, the transmission by him to me of a protest from his government against our expedition to Mexico and its consequences; the conclusion of an alliance, offensive and defensive, between the United States and Russia; the appearance of a federal fleet before Vera Cruz, &c., &c.

In regard to the protest, after remarking to me that I, better than any one else, knew that he had not transmitted to me any, Mr. Dayton said to me that, under the promptings of the general tenor of the corre-

spondence of Mr. Seward, and of the knowledge which he himself had of the inclinations of his fellow-citizens, he had been able to speak to me of the painful impression produced on public opinion in his country by the preponderant intervention of a European power in an American republic, and by the creation of a monarchical establishment in a country adjacent to the United States; but that from that to a protest, or to any intention whatever of comminatory intermeddling, was very far, and that nothing in his instructions authorized him to overleap that distance. He knew nothing, on the other hand, of the alleged alliance of his government with Russia, and he had every reason to disbelieve it. As to the presence of a federal fleet before Vera Cruz, this news did not seem to him even to merit the honor of a contradiction.

I told Mr. Dayton that I had never attached any importance to the reports which I had pointed out to him, and that, in speaking to him of them, my object was much less to call forth explanations on his part than to warn him against rumors of a different character; but having probably the same origin of which he had spoken to me, I could, however, contradict them categorically. In regard to the recognition of the States of the South, the intentions of the Emperor's government were known to him, and this question was still at the point where our late conversations had left it. We had not, therefore, recognized the South, and, much more, we had not signed with it any treaty for the cession of Louisiana and Texas. With respect to this, I could repeat to him, what I had so often said to him already, that we neither sought for ourselves, nor for others, any acquisition in America. I added that I trusted that the good sense of the people of the United States would do justice to exaggerations and false suppositions, by the aid of which it was endeavored to mislead and sour public opinion; and that I relied on his co-operation in trying to render prevalent a more equitable appreciation of our intentions and of the necessities which our policy obeyed.

I have thought, sir, that it was well that you should be informed of the particulars of this conversation, in order that you might, on your part, communicate it to Mr. Seward, and receive the precise words of it, in order to rectify around you false opinions and unjustifiable anticipations.

Accept, sir, the assurance of my high consideration,
DROUYN DE LHUYS.

Mr. MERCIER,
Minister of the Emperor at Washington.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 733.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, October 9, 1863.

SIR: I have received your dispatch of the 25th of September, No 503. While our country by its distractions invites aggressions on all sides, it is our difficult task to defeat the intrigues of disloyal emigrants from the United States in the most important courts of Europe. If I seem to confide too much in the explanations which we at any time receive from those courts, I trust that you will not therefore think it either unwise to give or unpleasant to me to receive whatever information you may be able to give to enable me to correct the apparent error. I think it quite probable that there is an inconstancy of policy in some of those quarters which, in some instances, produces demonstrations inconsistent

with the expressions which are set down in well-considered diplomatic communications. If I am never sure that we shall not have to encounter aggression from certain quarters before we reach the end of this war, I think every day that it is averted witnesses an increase of our ability to meet it, and therefore increases the hope that it may be avoided altogether. For this reason I study the formal expressions which are made to us more carefully than I do the imputed prevailing disposition of the parties by whom they are made.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 816.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 15, 1864.

SIR: Your dispatch of December 31 (No. 564) has been received and submitted to the President.

I thank you for calling my attention to the significant declaration, in a leading British journal, that, as for Great Britain, in regard to the two greatest risks and largest fields of danger, her securities are of a very opposite character—that she depends upon peace in Europe and war in America; upon war in America, because it is only too probable that a restoration of the national authority here, upon any terms, would be immediately followed by what are described as “most preposterous” demands upon Great Britain.

That the policy which her Majesty's government have thought proper to pursue in regard to the insurrection existing in this country has resulted in producing many grave claims on behalf of our citizens is a fact which manifestly appears in the diplomatic records of both countries. That these claims are sustained here by a deep and pervading popular conviction of their justice is apparent to all who weigh, however carelessly, the daily utterances of the organs of public opinion. It is, indeed, a question of deep interest to both countries, whether this condition of things will generate, when our domestic peace shall have been restored, a policy of unreasonable and litigious exactions upon the British government. We may safely refer to our correspondence with her Majesty's government to prove that the government of the United States does not desire such disturbed relations as a consequence of our war, while, if it be not disrespectful, I may add, that we are satisfied that her Majesty's government sincerely deprecates it. I do not apprehend, therefore, that the British government will take or pursue the policy indicated in the quarter to which I have alluded, with a view to prolongation of our civil war. That war has its evils and dangers for Great Britain, and for Europe, as well as for the United States, and for the American continent. Whatever errors or misconceptions may have heretofore prevailed in Europe in regard to the causes of the insurrection, and the freedom of this government from responsibility to the country and to mankind for its existence, and even for its duration, those errors and misapprehensions are now speedily clearing away, and it is daily becoming more apparent that the insurrection has derived its main support from European sympathies, and rests all its

future hopes upon European aid and recognition. I may even go further, and say that the British realm and British provinces already are seen to be the bases of the naval war which the insurgents affect to wage against our country; and that British capital and British seamen are seen to constitute the chief resource and strength of the pretended belligerent. I should not distrust the ultimate judgment of the British nation in our favor, and against its own government, if that government should pursue henceforth a policy calculated to protract the unhappy contest. Nor will I do the government any more than the nation so great a wrong as to believe that it could deliberately lend itself to any system of administration that would be calculated to injure or endanger the safety, peace, and welfare of a kindred and friendly nation.

The President has never failed to forecast the dangers of alienation between Great Britain and the United States, arising out of their civil war and surviving it; hence the earnestness of his increasing remonstrances against the concession of belligerent rights, and the continuance of that concession: hence his willingness to hear, and his promptness in seeking to adjust, the reasonable claims of British subjects, and meet the just expectations of her Majesty's government; hence the cheerfulness with which he has hastened to negotiate treaties designed to settle even difficulties which existed before the war, and to change early policies that favored discord between the two countries. It is his purpose to pursue this course to the end of his administration, and, so far as it shall be possible, to impress upon the habitual policy of the government a friendly and even fraternal disposition towards Great Britain, so that the two nations may go on harmoniously together, favoring everywhere the development of just principles of free, responsible government, and the progress of a humane civilization, especially in Central and Southern America, and in the portions of the eastern world now being reopened to western commerce.

The pursuit of this policy is not unattended by many embarrassments. Nothing but military disasters, not now apprehended, could induce the American people to believe themselves incompetent to grapple with all the foreign dangers incident to the fullest assertion of their rights, and a full redress of their wrongs, while, like every other nation, they naturally view these rights and wrongs under the influence of self-esteem, perhaps not altogether free from prejudices disparaging to other nations; nevertheless, the policy is practicable, and may be successfully established. They are only superficial observers who assume that the United States are a litigious and contentious nation, and who reason from that assumption that, when they shall have gained the blessings of internal peace, they will be found impatient for aggressive foreign war. I know that we have such interpreters in our public press; but they reason from the excitement of the present hour, not from the normal temperament of the American people. We have a continent to bring forward to a higher state of development and civilization than even Europe and the United States have yet attained. We have need to extend throughout the world a foreign commerce, which is an inevitable outgrowth of our internal commerce. We have institutions of self-government to maintain. These are most effectually maintained by commending them to the favorable opinion of mankind, and they can be so commended by showing that, in their practical operation, they do not instigate violence either at home or abroad, but are conservative of law, order, and universal peace.

But it is manifestly needful to the success of the President's policy that a corresponding spirit shall direct the action of the British govern-

ment during the period which shall intervene before our domestic peace is restored.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 823.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 1, 1864.

SIR:

There are some indications of a movement concerted in the insurgent region, and extending into Great Britain, to bring a supposed influence of her Majesty's government or of Parliament to bear upon this government, by some form of mediation or representation, with a view to obtain concessions or terms for the insurgents as conditions for the abandonment by them of their wicked and unnatural war against the United States.

It is proper that you should be able to say, if occasion for such explanation should become necessary, that this government now, not less than heretofore, would regard as unacceptable and unfriendly the intervention or advice of foreign states. The stability and safety of the American republic demand that it shall go through this the first national crisis, when foreign aid to overthrow it has been invoked by 'disloyal men, without yielding or abating any portion of its legal or even of its moral sovereignty and independence.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 853.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 24, 1864.

SIR: I have to acknowledge the receipt of your dispatch of February 5, No. 593, which is accompanied by a copy of the Queen's speech, and the debate thereon, at the opening of Parliament.

The situation of the ministry, in the face of the new European complications, is manifestly an embarrassing one; but it is not clearly seen how it could have been avoided, without incurring a risk of falling into more troublesome complications. If it be true, as you inform me, that evil disposed persons are preparing to renew the agitation for a recognition of the insurgents in the United States, the motive for the proceeding must be local and mercenary, or factious with reference to England herself; for I think there is abundant evidence that despondency pervades the domestic councils of the insurgents. No doubt of the failure of the insurrection exists here. If the British ministry should cordially accept this result before it becomes an historical fact, it would lay the foundations of permanent friendship between the two countries, and

would thus, as we think, indemnify itself for all the losses it has sustained in the fields of local and merely European politics.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 705.] LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, June 2, 1864.

SIR: * * * * * * *

Pending this result, Mr. Lindsay has thought it proper to postpone his motion for recognition, which he had assigned for to-morrow, to the 17th of the month. It is plain that he keeps it along in the hope of the happening of some event which might enable him to push it in at a moment of sudden excitement, with some prospect of carrying it at once. It is only in some such way that anything could possibly be done with it. The fact that the sympathies of the majority lean in that direction cannot be doubted. Whether they can be counted upon to such an extent as to produce the desired result is another question. It would, at least, require a complete defeat and dispersion of the government forces to render it probable.

* * * * * * *

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 725.] LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, June 23, 1864.

SIR: * * * * * * *

The motion of Mr. Lindsay seems to have dropped from the 'list. Events thus far have failed to bring to it even a plausible shadow of support.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 1012.] DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 27, 1864.

SIR: I transmit herewith for your information and guidance a copy of a dispatch from Mr. Dayton of the 10th of June, No. 486, and of my

reply, No. 592, of the 27th instant, relative to a report that suggestions for another effort are about being made between England and France to bring about peace in this country.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCOIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

No. 486.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, June 10, 1864.

SIR: I am just informed in a private way that suggestions for another effort are about being made between England and France to bring about peace in our country. No formal or official suggestion has been made from either side, nor is it supposed will be, and Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys says, I am informed, that he knows nothing about it; but it is reported to me as a fact officiously, though not officially, resolved upon. Of course it is said that this effort is to be of the most conciliatory character, &c. I have had so many advices and reports of this kind that I have lost faith in them and do not permit them to disturb me, but I have been advised for some short time past that something was stirring in reference to our affairs, and there may be more truth in this report than some that have gone before it.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

No. 592.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 27, 1864.

SIR: I have to acknowledge the receipt of your dispatch of the 10th of June, instant, No. 486.

In that paper you state that you have received information in a private way that suggestions for another effort are about being made between England and France to bring about peace in our country.

I am disinclined to believe that your information is accurate. It will, however, be easy for you to ascertain by inquiry of Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys. You are at liberty, but are not required to do this. If you find any reasons to believe these reports to be correct, you will then inform Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys that the United States adhere to their determination, heretofore announced, namely, to be exclusive of all foreign nations the arbiter of its own rights and duties in the present civil war.

A copy of your note and of this reply will be transmitted to Mr. Adams, and he will be authorized in his discretion to speak in the same sense to Earl Russell.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 744.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, July 14, 1864.

SIR: * * * * *

It is, however, in the midst of this existing delusion that Mr. Lindsay proposes once more to present to the consideration of the Commons his motion for the proposal of a mediation on the part of the combined powers of Europe, between the contending parties in America. It is now averred that he means seriously to bring it up to-morrow night. In anticipation of this movement, elaborate communications from the rebel emissaries or agents appeared simultaneously in the columns of the Times and the Post of yesterday. It is difficult to imagine any measure more entirely in conflict with the general tenor of the arguments of last week. The earnestness with which it appears, nevertheless, to be urged by the interested parties indicates only their sense of the pressing nature of their necessities. What will be the fate of the movement may be fairly gathered from the nature of the editorial comments made in both these papers, the substance of which may be comprised in the words "not yet." You will learn the result by the same steamer that carries this.

* * * * *
I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 751.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, July 21, 1864.

SIR: During the last year a very elaborate effort has been made to organize and concentrate public opinion in this country in favor of some form of intervention in the struggle in America. The shape which it finally took was the circulation by a self-constituted association of petitions to Parliament in favor of a movement to bring about a cessation of bloodshed.

The motion proposed by Mr. Lindsay in the House of Commons, of which I have made mention heretofore, was the object on which the results of these combined operations upon the people were to be brought to bear.

I now transmit to you a copy of the Observer of Sunday, the 17th instant, containing a report of the interview between a deputation of this society and the prime minister, Lord Palmerston, which took place on the day before. I also send a copy of the London Times of Monday, the 18th instant, which contains a leader on the subject, evidently prompted.

The sum of the matter is, that the whole movement has come to nothing. Circumstances had not been so favorable as had been hoped. I am not sure that the advance of the rebels, of which we are just getting

the intelligence, was not partly designed to support it. If so, it has come a little too late. The whole drift of the great debate which secured the continuance of the ministry in their places was to confirm their action in the only part of their foreign policy which has not been attacked.

Thus ends the fourth session of Parliament since the commencement of hostilities in America. Considering the notorious and now undisguised desire of the great majority to see effected the disruption of the United States, sustained and encouraged as it has been by the partial success, in resistance, of the rebels, I cannot but feel that this issue is one upon which we may congratulate ourselves. In all essential particulars the rebel position in Europe has gained no strength from time. Its audacious attempt to organize a navy in this kingdom, which at one moment received the flattering applause of Mr. Gladstone as an accomplished fact, have utterly failed. Its intrigues, ramified all over the continent of Europe through agents and presses suborned to circulate the most unscrupulous misrepresentations of the truth, have availed them little. Even the jealousy and fear of the growth of the United States, which is the true foundation of all the sympathy with them that is to be found among the influential classes of Europe, have been effective only in blunting to a partial extent the moral sensibilities that would otherwise have been deeply shocked at the announcement of an attempt, in the nineteenth century, by a portion of one race, to found a new government upon the absolute permanent subjection, so far as human power may avail, of another portion of their fellow-men.

* * * * *

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

— — — — —
Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 1049.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 28, 1864.

SIR: I have received and have read with deep interest your dispatch of the 14th of July, No. 744, which relates to the closing debate on the resolution of censure of the ministry, and the new movement of Mr. Lindsay for recognition of the insurgents, and the announcement that the session of Parliament will come to an end to-day.

Popular sympathies with Denmark, and what I willingly believe are partisan prejudices against the United States, seem to have been the chief supports of the resolution, while prudential regard to the ultimate attitude of the United States and other countries, the future of which is manifest to all observers, seem to have saved the government. No public interest requires, and propriety forbids, an examination on my part of the purely European questions which entered into the debate. I wish it could be as well understood in Great Britain as it is here, that there is no more any necessity for disturbance, or fear of disturbance, of the peace between Great Britain and the United States than there is any advantage to accrue to Great Britain from an uncertainty upon that point. The United States are unhappily engaged in a civil war, which, on the side of the government, is an involuntary, yet an inevitable and eminently moral contest. Though this is an unusual occurrence in our experience, yet civil war is not exceptional in the general experience of nations.

This civil war is exclusively our own affair; and if the government and people of Great Britain had treated it as such, from the first, as rigorously as they habitually treat civil war in the case of other nations, no ill feeling would have been engendered. During the latter part of the year 1863, the government of Great Britain manifested a decided determination not only to avoid intervention, but also to prevent unlawful naval intervention by British subjects. This manifestation produced a very happy effect in the United States. Congress assembled on the 7th of December, and did not adjourn until the 4th of July. The Senate confirmed a treaty which I had negotiated with Lord Lyons, and during all that long session not one expression of anger or discontent towards Great Britain was uttered at the Capitol. On the other hand, Parliament assembled in February, and the civil war was habitually brought up for debate in terms which indicated, or seemed to indicate, a pretension and a disposition on the part of Great Britain to intervene, if not forcibly, yet by diplomacy, in our civil war, if not unaided, at least with the support of one or more European allies. Questions arising in the course of the war, and affecting the rights of Great Britain or British subjects, have been invariably brought before Parliament and the British people in combination with denunciations of war itself, and propositions of intervention in favor of the insurgents. While the ministry have not concurred in this course of proceeding, they have often seemed to leave it doubtful whether they could successfully resist what was generally considered to be a natural proclivity to intervention. Impossible as it seems to be for the British public to comprehend the real character and the actual progress of the war, there is one fact on which they are never left in uncertainty, namely, that all foreign pretensions of intervention, or even of mediation, are deemed in the United States as not only officious, but alarming. Consequently our means adopted for suppressing the insurrection take on at every stage another and a special character—preparations on the largest possible scale to resist foreign aggression. We should not be either true Americans or true republicans if we were not even more unanimous in this policy than we are in overcoming insurgents, who, though now enemies, nevertheless are, and always must be, our countrymen and fellow-citizens. It is thus that it has happened that though, when the British Parliament assembled, it found amicable dispositions prevailing between the governments of the two countries, yet when that body adjourned a necessity seemed to have arisen for guarding against a possible change of these relations. We read that British subjects, whose ecclesiastical and political rank and position are supposed to lend importance to their proceedings, and who have notoriously and officiously aided and abetted the insurrection, formally appealed to the prime minister, at the close of the parliamentary struggle, to commit the British government to some form of joint or several intervention in the United States, and that this application was promptly refused. In that refusal her Majesty's government have done, in regard to this country, only what this government, ever since the war began, has done in regard to Great Britain. She has had her domestic discontents, less grave indeed than our own, in the British islands, and in British American provinces, in India, and in New Zealand. She has had controversies of a serious nature in China, and especially in Japan, and diplomatic conflicts with European powers. The government of the United States has not sought to increase these discontents and exasperate these conflicts; on the contrary, whenever it could not lawfully or properly favor British interests, this government has been silent; and whenever it could lawfully and properly favor them, it has given them generous and cheerful

support. There is now ground for believing that the traitorous insurgents have abandoned their hopes of obtaining a naval force in European ports adequate to raise our blockade, and are, therefore, leaving the British coast and the British shores. If this fact shall prove to be true, the ministry will be sensibly relieved of an embarrassment which unnecessary and precipitate toleration at the beginning of the war rendered unavoidable. If the government shall now find themselves able, as we have no doubt they are well disposed, to induce the British nation to leave the struggle in the United States to the exclusive care of the people of the United States, the peace between the two countries may be regarded as perpetual, and out of such a peace feelings of amity and friendship must come, which will be unquestionably more useful than any merely political convention that could be contracted between the parties.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 753.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, July 28, 1864.

SIR: * * * * *

Mr. Lindsay's movement degenerates, at last, into a bare inquiry addressed to Lord Palmerston. I transmit a copy of the London Times of the 26th instant, containing a report of his lordship's rather curt answer. Thus has terminated an operation which has cost much labor and money to somebody or other.

* * * * *

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

[From Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, vol. 176, p. 2018.]

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
Monday, July 25, 1864.

UNITED STATES—THE CIVIL WAR.

Mr. LINDSAY, before putting the question of which he had given notice, had desired to have made a statement, containing some important facts bearing upon the American war, and tending to show how futile was the attempt to restore the Union and to coerce the South; but as he had no opportunity now of doing so, he begged simply to ask the first lord of the treasury if, considering the great sacrifice of life and property occasioned by the war still raging between the United States of America and the Confederate States, and considering the loss the people of this country have suffered by the war, it is the intention of her Majesty's government, in concert with the other powers of Europe, to use their endeavors to bring about a suspension of hostilities?

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON. I can assure my honorable friend that her Majesty's government deeply lament the great sacrifice of life and property in America and the distress which that war has produced in this country. But we have not thought that in the present state of things there was any advantage to be gained by entering into concert with any other powers for the purpose of proposing or offering mediation, or of negotiating with the government of the United States or of the Confederate States, to bring about a termination of this unhappy war.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 1058.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, August 1, 1864.

SIR: I transmit to you for your information the inclosed copy of my dispatch of the 30th ultimo, No. 621, addressed to William L. Dayton, esq., the United States minister at Paris, relative to the report of an intended new design on the part of the Emperor of the French to propose mediation in our civil war.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton

No. 621.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 30, 1864.

SIR: I have your dispatch of the 13th of July, No. 510, which recalls the report of an intended new design on the part of the Emperor of the French to propose mediation in our civil war. I approve of the reticence you have practiced on the subject in your communication with Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys, and of the reasons you assign for that reserve. I have only to say upon the subject itself, that any such proceeding would meet with a prompt and decided answer from the United States. The principle of foreign mediation in our affairs cannot be, in any form or under any circumstances, admitted. You will make this explanation or refrain from making it in the exercise of your own discretion. But when you find it necessary to speak upon pretensions of mediation in any quarter, you will be expected to speak not doubtfully in the sense in which I have written.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM L. DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 1063.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, August 8, 1864.

SIR: I have to acknowledge the receipt of your dispatch of the 21st of July, No. 751, in which you have detailed the history of the efforts of the insurgent emigrants to procure from her Majesty's government a recognition of their impracticable confederacy, and their signal

failure. I thank you very sincerely for this paper. It goes far to confirm the expectation I have always entertained, that if our foreign affairs could be conducted with a reasonable show of justice, firmness, and prudence, we should be allowed the exclusive responsibility of maintaining through its sanguinary trial our inestimable institution of civil government.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 1245.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 23, 1865.

SIR: It was my belief, when the election closed, that the national determination which it manifested would tend to demoralize the insurgents, and, if not to confound, at least to embarrass their abettors abroad. I thought that the decisive tone of the President's message would be effective in the same way. First, I have been unable to believe that insurgent confidence, either at home or abroad, could revive under the severe pressure of the national arms. Nevertheless, we have ever since the election had occasional revelations here and in Europe of insurgent expectations of recognition by Great Britain and France. These revelations have sometimes come in the shape of warnings from known and responsible insurgent agents, who professed to be desirous of saving their own misguided people from the infamy of foreign protection.

It has been heretofore impossible to find a clue to the premises upon which their expectations were based. I think I have now found it in an article of the Richmond Sentinel of the 18th of January, a copy of which I inclose. The idea of the insurgents seems to be this: That inasmuch as the rebels are prevented the exercise of suffrage in the insurgent States in the late presidential election, therefore this government in the next administration will not be, *de jure*, a government over these States, which by the treaty of peace of 1783 were acknowledged to be free, independent, sovereign States. The conceit is a refinement of the secession principle, which the war has already effectually exploded. Still I have thought it not inexpedient to bring the subject to your notice. While I do not attribute any serious importance to it, it may be worth your while to be watchful for any revelations of the project in the vicinity of your residence.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[Same to Mr. Bigelow.]

[Editorial from the Richmond Sentinel, January 18.]

FOREIGN RELATIONS OF THE CONFEDERACY.

The nations of western Europe have just put themselves and us to many disadvantages by their failure to recognize the confederate government, and institute with us diplomatic relations. A state of war invests with a peculiar delicacy the relations of a belligerent with a

mutual power. It requires much care and address to adjust satisfactorily the many questions which arise between them; especially is this the case while there is much conflict of interests, such as an extensive intercourse necessarily produces. To all these hazards and inconveniences to them and to us France and England have submitted for four years without the ameliorations which a diplomatic interchange would have afforded. They have denied themselves and us the means of asking or giving explanation, and of making representation closely affecting in many cases the interests of citizens entitled to protection, or, in a more general sense, the rights and duties of respective governments.

The great convenience of the policy long recognized in America, of acknowledging a *de facto* government without delay, has been strikingly illustrated by the effect of the different principles which France and England have prescribed to themselves in their dealings with us. If American policy had been applied to American affairs, four years of embarrassment would have been avoided. There is a prevalent presumption, however, that the reserve which has produced so much inconvenience is about to be abandoned. It is supposed by many who read the signs of the times that France and England will not much longer deny themselves the liberty of holding interviews with a people with whom they have so much business to transact. We say nothing of the comity or the duty which they owe to an organized community so large and respectable as ours; viewing the subject simply in the light of their own interest, and of their duty to their own citizens, the shackles with which they have so long voluntarily restrained their action are truly extraordinary.

If the two governments to whom we refer have come to the resolution of terminating that deference, not to the principles but to the will of the Washington government, which wears the appearance of vassalage, they would have at any moment an abundance of solid and satisfactory measures to sustain them in such a step. But the conjecture which is assigned as the probable occasion on which the new attitude will be assumed, the next inauguration of Mr. Lincoln, is singularly propitious to such a proceeding. It will afford not merely a pretext for that action, but a new ground, sufficient of itself to justify and to require it. We will explain this by the narration of some facts which we find collected in a very convenient form in Mr. McHenry's excellent book, "*The Cotton Trade.*"

France, on the 5th of February, 1778, acknowledged the independence of the thirteen American colonies *as so many independent States*. Even the Articles of Confederation were not then adopted. The United Netherlands followed this example October 8, 1782, and Sweden, April 3, 1783. Great Britain, in the treaty of peace, concluded September 3, 1783, recognized the several States in like manner as so many independent political communities. This recognition embraced Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, by name, and it territorially included Tennessee, Florida, and Mississippi. The remaining confederate States became possessed by their organization and admission of equal rights with the original States, and stand on the same footing. The independent nationality of Texas was recognized by France in 1839, and by Great Britain in 1840. She did not enter the Union until 1845.

In no other form has the nationality of the United States ever been acknowledged by European courts. John Adams was, in 1777, sent to represent the States in France, and was soon after succeeded by Dr. Franklin. They both received their authority from the Congress of Delegates of the several States. The Articles of Confederation were not adopted till March, 1781. Mr. Adams, under an appointment received in 1789, remained as minister to England till 1798.

The Union formed by the Articles of Confederation was dissolved March 3, 1789. The Union under the Constitution did not go into operation until April 30, 1789, and then only as between eleven States, Rhode Island and North Carolina for a time remaining aloof.

In all these changes of the agency for conducting their foreign intercourse, the States deemed no notification necessary to other governments. No recognition was asked for any such nation as the confederation of States, for there was no such created, nor for any such nation as the United States, for the same reason. The governments established by the Articles of Confederation and by the Constitution were the mere foreign agencies of the States, the true sovereigns, whose nationality was already acknowledged. The European governments conceded to us the right to change the form of this agency whenever we pleased. The recognition of the independence of the States survived all these changes unharmed; the disbanding of the confederation in 1783, the intervening of fifty-eight days that followed, the separation of the State, which then continued for some time, Rhode Island and North Carolina remaining distinct, and the accessions to the number of States, which afterwards occurred from time to time. The ministers sent by the federal agent were received on the original acknowledgment of the nationality of the several States, and no other. No other was desired; no other was proffered; no other was thought necessary or appropriate. Let us notice some of the consequences which may be deduced from this view of the case, looking at it from a foreign stand-point, and excluding all reference to our own controversy as to the right of secession. France and England might say that Mr. Lincoln was appointed in 1860 by an election in which all the States participated; that thus he was regularly constituted the diplomatic representative of all the States for a specified term; that as such Europe recognized him as appointed, according to our own forms. After the fourth of March next he will sustain, however, a new character. He will have entered upon a term of service to which various of the States acknowledged by Europe as independent had no part in electing him. He cannot claim to have any commission from Virginia or North Carolina, or the rest of the Confederate States. He can show no authority to represent them. These latter States at once refrained, and were excluded from all share in his appointment. Of this Europe is duly notified, and it would be both an outrage and a perfidy to acknowledge as the representative of States recognized as independent an agent in whose appointment they had no share. As well might the European Maximilian assume to represent the Confederate States as the man who rules at Washington. Virginia and the rest have claimed to change their foreign agency frequently in the past, and it has been accorded. How can the right be questioned now? Their responsibility for Lincoln's appointment as the organ for foreign intercourse has been discharged by the expiration of the term for which he was elected. In the new appointment they had no part and were allowed none, and hence it cannot be pretended that it represents them either in substance or form. We say that such views as these may well be adopted by France and England without reference to the other merit of our cause, and we do not see how they can be overlooked, or how they can be met; and taking into consideration the duties which those governments owe to their own people, to their own dignity, to sound international principles, and to us—duties, however, which they have declined until the neglect has become a severe reproach—we think it very reasonable and very probable that they will indeed profit by the opportunity to abandon their present situation with good grace.

ENFORCEMENT OF NEUTRALITY.

ENFORCEMENT OF NEUTRALITY.

ENFORCEMENT OF NEUTRALITY.

GENERAL SUBJECT OF THE ENFORCEMENT OF NEUTRALITY.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 30.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 28, 1861.

SIR: I herewith transmit to you a copy of two advertisements which appeared in Gere's General Advertiser, of Liverpool, on the 6th instant, which would seem to indicate a deliberate purpose to disregard our blockade. As it is understood that there is an act of the British Parliament, similar to our act of neutrality of the 20th of April, 1818, I have to request that if any infringement of the British act, adverse to the rights of this government, should come to your knowledge, you will cause complaint thereof to be made, in order that the parties implicated may be prosecuted according to law.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCOIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[From Gere's General Advertiser, Liverpool, June 6, 1861.]

NEW ORLEANS.—STEAM COMMUNICATION BETWEEN LIVERPOOL AND NEW ORLEANS.—The British and American Southern Steamship Company's first-class iron screw-steamers are intended to sail from Liverpool to New Orleans, as follows: Malacca, 7th August; Rangoon, 4th September; to be followed every alternate Wednesday by other first-class screw-steamers, now building. For further particulars apply to F. Sabel, agent, 19 Water street, Liverpool.

CHARLESTON.—STEAM COMMUNICATION BETWEEN LIVERPOOL AND CHARLESTON.—A first-class steamship will be dispatched from Liverpool to Charleston on or about the 15th July next. A monthly service will be established. Goods and passengers for New Orleans, Mobile, and Savannah can be forwarded by this line, Charleston having direct railway communication with all the southern and western cities. For further particulars apply to Fraser, Trenholm & Co., 10 Rumbold Place, or to M. G. Klingender & Co., Tower Buildings, 22 Water street.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 53.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, August 1, 1861.

SIR: I learn, through what seems a very direct channel, that Mr. J. D. Bullock, of Savannah, Georgia, is in Europe; that he has contracted

for ten iron steamers, gunboats, all to be armed, at \$750,000 for all, and all to come out as war vessels.

You will be able to collate this information with other statements of the same character, of which you are already possessed.

I think the agent, Captain Walker, whom I sent to Europe, will be able to get at the bottom of the matter.

The President expects that, of course, you will secure the aid of the government in arresting the movement, if you can get at the facts.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 35.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, August 30, 1861.

SIR:

You will before this have formed some notion of the extent of my power in this way, from my success in preventing the departure of the Bermuda. No stronger case is likely to be made out against any parties than this. The activity of our consuls, Messrs. Wilding and Davy, furnished me with very exact information of all the circumstances attending the equipment of this vessel, and yet her Majesty's government, on being apprised of it, disclaimed all power to interfere. Under these circumstances, all that seems left to me to do is to gather such information of these movements as I may for transmission to the department in season to be on the lookout to intercept the supplies before they reach the coast.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 85.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, September 10, 1861.

SIR: I transmit a copy of an intercepted letter of the 30th of July last, from John P. Baldwin, of Richmond, Virginia, to Henry Adderley, at Nassau, New Providence, relative to the shipment of arms and powder from that place for the use of the insurgents in this country. The existing British statute for the prevention of armed expeditions against countries at peace with Great Britain is understood to be similar to our act of Congress of the 5th of April, 1818. Proceedings like that referred to in the letter of Baldwin, however, afford us special reason to expect legislation on the part of the British government of the character of our act of 1838, referred to in my instruction to you of the 7th instant, numbered 83. It may be, however, that the British executive government now has the power to prevent the exportation of contraband of war

from British colonies near the United States for the use of the insurgents in the South. Should this be the fact, you will bring the subject to the attention of Lord Russell, and request that proper instructions in regard to it may be given to the colonial authorities.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[For inclosure see dispatch No. 53, of Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward, dated October 4, 1861, *post.*]

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 86.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, September 11, 1861.

SIR: Your dispatch of August 23d has been received.

The inefficiency of the British laws to prevent violations of our rights is deeply to be regretted. We shall necessarily be obliged to exercise vigilance in detecting the unlawful character and objects of British vessels approaching our coasts, which will not be pleasant to the government whose flag they will be perverting to such unfriendly uses.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 89.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, September 14, 1861.

SIR: Your dispatch of August 30 (No. 35) has been received. While I regret with you that the administration of the laws of Great Britain is such as to render comparatively ineffectual your efforts to defeat there the designs of parties in that country injurious to the United States, I have great pleasure in saying that the information we receive from you concerning them is often very valuable, and enables us to put our own authorities here in a way of vigilant surveillance, which promises good results.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 97.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, September 25, 1861.

SIR: Your dispatch of September 6 (No. 38) has been received.

Our naval force is rapidly increasing, and the command of it has recently been reorganized. We are preparing for some vigorous demonstrations on the coast, to begin in about ten days; and I trust, there-

fore, that we shall be able to defeat on this side the enterprises of the insurgents, which we have been unable to prevent on the other.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 53.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, October 4, 1861.

SIR :

The dispatch No. 85, dated the 10th of September, like its immediate predecessor, No. 84, relates to cases of violation of neutrality in the British islands in the West Indies. I have now the honor to forward copies of two notes addressed by me to Lord Russell, one of the 30th September and the other of the following day, touching these questions.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, October 1, 1861.

MY LORD: It is with much regret that I find myself receiving, at every fresh arrival from the United States, instructions from my government to make representations to your lordship concerning alleged violations of her Majesty's proclamation of neutrality, committed by British subjects through the channel of the colonies situated near the United States. I have the honor now to submit to your lordship's consideration the copy of an intercepted letter from a person named John P. Baldwin, living at Richmond, in Virginia, in the service of the insurgents, addressed to Henry Adderley, esq., of Nassau, New Providence. It appears by this letter that Nassau has been made, to some extent, an entrepot for the transmission of articles contraband of war from Great Britain to the ports held by the insurgents. It would be a great source of satisfaction to the government of the United States to learn that her Majesty's government felt itself clothed with the necessary power to prevent the exportation of such contraband from the colonies for the use of the insurgents, and that it would furnish the necessary instructions to the local authorities to attain that end.

I pray your lordship to accept the assurances of the highest consideration, with which I have the honor to be your lordship's most obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

The Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Baldwin to Mr. Adderley.

RICHMOND, VIRGINIA, *July 30, 1861.*

MY DEAR ADDERLEY: The secretary of the navy of the Confederate States of America has ordered from England, to be shipped to Nassau, a quantity of arms and powder. I have recommended them to be consigned to you, and I have to ask of you, as a favor to me, to take good care of them. I will be with you soon, and will expect your aid in transshipping the same.

I must request you to regard this as a confidential communication, and will explain the reasons when we meet. You need not write me at all on the subject.

Hoping soon to see you, I remain your friend,

JNO. P. BALDWIN.

HENRY ADDERLEY, Esq.,
Nassau, N. P., Bahamas.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 136.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 30, 1861.

SIR: *

3d. When we asked the British government, in all kindness, to exclude piratical vessels which are preying upon our merchant marine engaged in carrying bread to Europe from British ports, we received for answer that the law officers of the crown say that to supply such vessels with shelter, coal, and provisions does not conflict with her Majesty's proclamation, and thus these pirates are afforded by Great Britain privileges which are denied by every other civilized and Christian state.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 105.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, January 24, 1862.

SIR: The only event of any importance connected with American affairs that has happened during the last week is the revocation of the orders prohibiting the exportation of arms and munitions of war. This will release the large quantity of saltpeter in the hands of parties here, and will probably renew the activity of the confederate emissaries in forwarding supplies to the insurgents. Mr. Davy reports to me the arrival of the *Bermuda* at Hartlepool. Though it is denied that she is to be dispatched again, I am inclined to believe it only a pretense in order to quiet suspicion. In the meanwhile the relative position of the *Nashville* and of the *Tuscarora* in the harbor of Southampton remains

unchanged. On the other hand, the Sumter, having been warned to leave Cadiz, has put into Gibraltar, after capturing two vessels. This tendency to take refuge in British ports is becoming so annoying to the government here that I shall not be surprised if the limit of twenty-four hours' stay be soon adopted.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

Secretary of State.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

[Extracts.]

No. 100.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,

Paris, January 27, 1862.

SIR: Since my dispatch of the 18th instant I have received yours,
No. 97.

* * * * *

Your dispatch afforded me an excuse for asking of Mr. Thouvenel a special interview. It was granted for Friday last, when I had with him a long conference, and, I think, made an impression on his mind in reference, at all events, to certain points.

I suggested to him, according to your directions, the propriety of calling the attention of the British government to the suggestion in your note to Mr. Mercier in reference to the better settlement of certain principles of maritime law. I assured him that the government of the United States would at all times be ready and willing to assent to any general arrangement which would have for its effect the permanent settlement of the rights of neutrals on a liberal basis; that we did not want the present occasion to pass without fixing upon Great Britain especially, in a definite form, certain principles for which France and the United States had always contended, but to which Great Britain had never yielded her assent. I reminded him that while we were not, at the present moment, in the most favorable position to move in such a matter, France could, under all the circumstances, with great propriety and power, take the initiative; that it seemed to me very desirable she should do so, and that something should be done before the question of the Trent should become mere matter of history, to take its place as a single precedent amongst others, and to be dealt with, canvassed, or avoided by the statesmen of that country as interest or inclination might prompt. Mr. Thouvenel thought that Great Britain could not now get back of this precedent, but said that France could do nothing alone; she must consult with other powers. He suggested a commission of juriconsults, who should prepare and present for discussion certain questions, which should be submitted to a congress of ministers or ambassadors, something, I suppose, after the manner of the congress of Paris of 1856. This I inferred to be a suggestion only. It indicated, however, a willingness to act in the matter, if any available means could be found for doing so. In calling his attention, among other matters, to those questions affecting the interests of neutrals, I told him that, without having any distinct authority from my government for saying so, I had no doubt it would be happy to adopt the most liberal policy in reference to blockades, either to abolish them by the general assent of all nations,

or modify them in such way as to make them, in the least possible degree, detrimental to the great interests of commerce. He at once asked if I intended to include in my remark the blockade that we had established of the ports of the South. This afforded me an opportunity, and I replied, in the language of your dispatch, by telling him that this blockade was "a thing daily more and more falling within our power to modify, if not remove altogether." I reminded him that it was manifestly the interest of the United States, having a great commercial marine, (though not a large naval power,) to remove all obstacles in the way of the most free commercial intercourse, and I ventured to assure him that our government was too wise and far-seeing to permit any transient matter to interfere with the attainment of a great end, or the adoption of a most liberal and enlightened commercial policy.

I have the honor to be, with much respect, your obedient servant,
WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 182.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 13, 1862.

SIR: Westerly winds have hindered the steamers so that it is only after a period of twenty days that I now receive your dispatch of the 24th of January, No. 105.

It affords us pleasure to know that the inhibition against the exportation of saltpeter, which was so unnecessary, has been rescinded.

It has been only European sympathies and European aid that have enabled our disloyal citizens to prolong the civil war. The commercial advantages which Great Britain derives from her present policy are, a trade with the insurgents in articles contraband of war, and in less illegitimate merchandise introduced into the disloyal States in contravention of a vigorous blockade. Besides this commercial advantage, Great Britain gains the security of an acknowledgment of her immunity as a neutral by the pirates who are engaged in destroying our commerce. But the pirates are outlaws, having the control of not one port in our own country. On the other hand, what inconveniences do not result to Great Britain herself from her unnecessary and undeserved concessions to the insurgents? Alarms, apprehensions, and preparations for war with that one of all the nations whose constitution and habits most incline it to peace, and which, if left in the enjoyment of peace, is always at once the most liberal in its supplies of material and provisions to the British manufacturers, and the most liberal consumer of their fabrics.

Has not the policy of Great Britain in regard to our internal troubles been adhered to long enough? This is a question for the British government. If the British government shall still think it necessary to persevere, is it asking too much of them that they shall lend the protection of their courts to the enforcement of the neutrality which the Queen's proclamation commands? Will they stand by and see the Bermuda again fitted out with munitions and arms by British subjects, to be employed by insurgents in their attempts to overthrow the government of the United States?

When Spain refuses shelter to the Sumter, is Great Britain willing that she shall rest from her work of destruction, and repair in the harbor of Gibraltar?

These indulgences extended to pirates, who are destroying our commerce, must, sooner or later, give rise to the questions, What wrong have the United States done or even meditated against Great Britain? What duty of neutrality, or even friendship, which they owed to Great Britain, have they failed to perform? What fault have they committed in their national conduct? They, indeed, are involved in a domestic strife, but it is a strife which, while they are fighting for their own existence, is, at the same time, purely a war of self-defense.

In your own way please bring these views to the attention of Earl Russell. Meantime I shall refer the matter you mention relative to the Bermuda and the Sumter to the Secretary of the Navy. I doubt not that, if we must maintain war in European waters against American pirates, in addition to the naval operations in which we already are engaged nearer home, we shall be able to meet that responsibility with full success.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 184]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, February 14, 1862.

SIR: I herewith transmit to you the copy* of a communication of the 24th ultimo, addressed to this department by the consul general of the United States at Havana. It has reference to the conduct of the master of the English steamer General Miramon, off the port of Mobile, in the month of May last. It will be seen that, in violation of a solemn pledge, the captain of the General Miramon grossly abused a privilege granted to him by Flag Officer McKean from motives of humanity.

You will make the facts known to the British government, and express the expectation of the President that, if that government has the necessary power, it will cause the captain of the Miramon to be suitably punished for his perfidy.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Lord Lyons.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, February 21, 1862.

MY LORD: I have submitted to the President the copy of an instruction from Earl Russell which you left with me, and which bears the date of January 23d.

In this paper Earl Russell sets forth certain points upon which the

*For inclosure see dispatch from Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward, No. 131, March 13, 1862, *post*.

British government differs from some of the conclusions which I presented to you in my note upon the Trent affair, of the 26th of December last.

It is perceived that these differences do not disturb the conclusion contained in that paper upon which the case of the Trent was disposed of by this government.

The differences stated by Earl Russell involve questions of neutral rights in maritime warfare, which, though of confessed importance, are not practically presented in any case of conflict now existing between the United States and Great Britain. It is very desirable, however, that these questions should be settled, if possible, by an early understanding between the two governments. Nevertheless, Earl Russell, I think, will agree with me that they relate only to a part of the international law of maritime war, while there are other and kindred questions equally important and equally likely to arise in the disturbed condition of affairs which exists on this continent, and in any conflict which may happen in Europe. All such questions, moreover, affect not only these two nations, but all the other maritime powers. Earl Russell need not be reminded that the necessity which has existed for meliorations of the law of maritime war in regard to neutrals has been a subject of debates and even of conventions of such powers. The friendly relations which this government holds to such powers require that all that it does in this connection should be done with their full knowledge and with an expressed desire for their co-operation. This government has taken an active part in seeking to promote such meliorations through such conventions. Its views on this subject have undergone no change. It will cheerfully second any negotiations to that end which Great Britain, or any other maritime power, will inaugurate. If it shall seem preferable, it will itself initiate such proceedings. Our ministers accredited to such powers will, at an early day, receive full instructions to this effect. In the meantime, your lordship may assure Earl Russell that, while the United States will justly claim as their own the belligerent rights which the customary practice allows to nations engaged in war, according to our present convictions, there is no melioration of the maritime law, or of the actual practice of maritime war, that the leading maritime states, including Great Britain, shall think desirable, which will not be cheerfully assented to by the United States, even to the most liberal asylum for persons and the extreme point of exemption of private property from confiscation in maritime war.

I avail myself of this opportunity to renew to your lordship the assurance of my high consideration.

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

Right Hon. LORD LYONS, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 131.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, March 13, 1862.

SIR: In obedience to the instructions contained in your dispatch No. 184, of the 14th of February, I have addressed a note to Lord Russell in regard to the conduct of the master of the British steamer General Miramon, a copy of which is herewith transmitted.

It will be perceived that I have ventured to introduce another and a different cause of complaint, which suggested itself to me in the perusal of the report of the discussion in both houses of Parliament on the blockade. I have done so, not in the expectation of effecting any purpose of checking the notorious tendency of the commercial classes, but rather to put on record on the part of the government of the United States the consciousness of its existence; for the time may come when there will be attempts to deny it. There are people in England who still pretend that the complaints which brought on the war of 1812 were ill founded. But for the evidence perpetuated by the official records of the government of the United States, this story might become the established faith of the nation. And so it may be in the event of a restoration of our affairs. It will probably be affirmed here that there was a rigid abstinence throughout our time of trial from all attempts to do us injury. In opposition to this, it may be as well to have it in our power to show that, outside of the lines of the rebel States, nearly all the active sympathy and positive assistance has come from the subjects of Great Britain. At this very moment the means which the insurgents have to carry on the war are derived from them, and vessels are fitting out as well as actually on the way to supply them continually with more.

I transmit a copy of a note just received from Lord Russell, in acknowledgment of mine.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, March 10, 1862.

MY LORD: It is with much regret that I am constrained to lay before you the copy of a letter addressed to the Department of State by the consul general of the United States at Havana, containing a serious complaint against the conduct of the master of the British steamer General Miramon, off the port of Mobile, in the month of May last.

It would appear from the statements therein made, if in accordance with the facts, that Captain Golding took advantage of a privilege granted to him to enter the port of Mobile, upon his profession of a desire to perform an act of humanity, to abuse the confidence thus placed in him, by discharging one cargo of merchandise, and taking off another, in violation of the blockade known to be established at that place.

It is almost needless to remind your lordship how much the disposition to relieve to neutral nations the inconveniences inevitably attending a blockade must be affected by the misconduct of such of their citizens as prove to have no respect for moral obligations. It is not without regret that I am compelled to add that this is by no means the only instance which has come within my observation of a desire of British citizens to interfere with the blockade in every manner possible. Not only have the newspapers in Great Britain contained advertisements of vessels about to depart, with the declared intention of violating it, but I have reason to believe that respectable assurance companies in London have gone so far as to establish a specific rate of premium at which they

are prepared to guarantee the property engaged in such unlawful venture. The effect of such conduct, in weakening the confidence which my countrymen desire to feel in the friendly disposition of the people of Great Britain, is easily to be conceived. It is no part of my intention in making this representation to imply the existence of any desire on the part of her Majesty's ministers, or of the British nation at large to give the smallest countenance to such hostile demonstrations.

My purpose is rather to solicit such action, if it be within the power of the government, as may, by putting the seal of public reprobation upon a single well-authenticated act of dishonesty, serve to deter other evil-minded persons from pursuing the same path in future.

Praying your lordship to accept the assurances of my highest consideration, I have the honor to be, my lord, your most obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Shufeldt to Mr. Seward.

No. 9.] UNITED STATES CONSULATE GENERAL,
Havana, January 24, 1862.

SIR: I inclose a letter of mine to J. T. Crawford, esq., her Britannic Majesty's consul general, in which I deemed it my duty to inform Mr. Crawford of the conduct of the master of the English steamer "General Miramon," off the port of Mobile, in the month of May last, as therein expressed. I also inclose his reply thereto.

I am, sir, with respect,

R. W. SHUFELDT,
Consul General.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Shufeldt to Mr. Crawford.

UNITED STATES CONSULATE GENERAL,
Havana, January 18, 1862.

MY DEAR SIR: I desire to communicate for your information the fact, received from Flag Officer McKean, of the United States blockading fleet in the Gulf of Mexico, that the English steamer "Miramon," now or recently lying in this port, was permitted to enter the harbor of Mobile under a solemn pledge from the master, named Golding, that he would come out, without breaking cargo, on the following day, his object being to land a lady passenger, and seriously ill. This occurrence happened in May last, and the permission was granted by Flag Officer McKean himself. In violation of this pledge, the Miramon discharged her cargo in Mobile, and has recently brought another to this port. I need not say to you that so gross an abuse of a privilege granted purely from motives of humanity will render the future movements of this vessel liable to more than ordinary suspicion.

I am, my dear sir, truly and respectfully, your obedient servant,

R. W. SHUFELDT,
Consul General.

J. T. CRAWFORD, C. B.,
Her Britannic Majesty's Consul General in Cuba.

Mr. Crawford to Mr. Shufeldt.

HAVANA, January 20, 1862.

MY DEAR SIR AND COLLEAGUE: I have the pleasure of acknowledging the receipt of your letter of the 18th instant, communicating to me the fact, which you have received from Flag Officer McKean, of the United States blockading fleet in the Gulf of Mexico, respecting the British steamer "General Miramon," which vessel Flag Officer McKean informs you he permitted to enter the port of Mobile under a solemn pledge from the master, named Golding, that he would come out without breaking cargo on the following day; but that the master violated that pledge, as the "Miramon" discharged her cargo at Mobile, and has recently brought another to this port; and you observe that such conduct on the part of the master will render the future movements of this vessel liable to more than ordinary suspicion.

I notice by the "Diario de la Marina" that the "General Miramon" is advertised for sale here, but I have no idea of what will be her future movements.

Believe me to remain, my dear sir and colleague, yours, very truly and sincerely,

JOSEPH T. CRAWFORD,
Consul General in Cuba.

R. W. SHUFELDT, Esq.,
United States Consul General, Havana.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, March 13, 1862.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th instant, calling attention to the conduct of the captain of the British steamer General Miramon, as reported to your government by the United States consul at Havana, in discharging a cargo of merchandise and taking off another at Mobile; the captain of the General Miramon having been allowed to enter that port while under blockade, in consequence of his having stated to the commander of the blockading squadron that his object in going to Mobile was to perform an act of humanity. You also call my attention to the number of vessels lading cargoes in this country with the declared intention of running the blockade, and you request that her Majesty's government will take such action in the matter as may be within their power.

I have the honor, in reply, to state that, if the facts as alleged against the captain of the General Miramon are not susceptible of a satisfactory explanation, her Majesty's government would much regret that a British ship-master should have abused the confidence of the commander of the United States blockading squadron; and, as regards the second point to which you call my attention, I have to assure you that the matter shall have the due consideration of her Majesty's government.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 135.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, March 27, 1862.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the reception from the department of dispatches numbered from 199 to 203, inclusive.

It will have come to your knowledge, by the reception of my dispatch No. 131, of the 13th of March, that I had already acted in conformity with the suggestions contained in your No. 207, dated on the 11th, by addressing a note to Earl Russell in remonstrance against the notorious activity of the subjects of Great Britain in efforts to set at nought the blockade. To that communication I have not yet received a reply. The reception of a letter from Mr. Dudley, the consul at Liverpool, containing additional information to the same effect, supplied me with a new occasion to write to his lordship in the spirit of your dispatch No. 196, of the 27th of February. A copy of this latest note, dated the 26th instant, is herewith transmitted. After a full conversation with Mr. Morse, we both arrived at the conclusion that the evidence in our possession would not sustain so broad a position as that contemplated in your letter; for, whatever may have been the purposes of the confederate emissaries and their friends, pending the difficulties connected with the Trent case—and I am inclined to believe they went to the full extent indicated—I fancy they have shrunk within much smaller compass since that speck of war has disappeared. The activity is now mainly directed to the expediting of every species of supply through the means of steam vessels, which may themselves be turned to some account in the way of illicit trade or of piratical warfare. Of these last, the *Oreto* seems to be the only one likely to prove formidable. I thought it, therefore, a good opportunity to place upon his lordship the responsibility of the consequences of permitting himself to be deluded by what I cannot help thinking the willful blindness and credulous partiality of the British authorities at Liverpool. From the experience of the past, I have little or no confidence in the success of any application that may be made of the kind. It is not the less important, for all that, to perpetuate the testimony for future use. That Great Britain did, in the most terrible moment of our domestic trial, in struggling with a monstrous social evil she had earnestly professed to abhor, coldly and at once assume our inability to master it, and then become the only foreign nation steadily contributing in every indirect way possible to verify its prejudgment, will probably be the verdict made up against her by posterity on a calm comparison of the evidence. I do not mean to say that such has been the course of the whole people. A considerable portion of them in all classes have been actuated by nobler views. There is, throughout England, a great deal of warm though passive sympathy with America. But there is likewise an extraordinary amount of fear as well as of jealousy. And it is these last passions which have pervaded the mass of the governing classes, until they have inscribed for the whole nation a moral and political record which no subsequent action will ever avail to obliterate.

I am bound to notice in several of your late dispatches a strong disposition to press upon the British government an argument for a retraction of its original error in granting to the rebels the rights of a belligerent. There may come a moment when such a proceeding might

seem to me likely to be of use. But I must frankly confess that I do not see it yet. The very last speech of Lord Russell in the House of Lords is, from beginning to end, inspired by an opposite idea. The final disruption of the United States, and the ultimate recognition of the seceding States, are as visible in every word of that address as they were in the letter of the same nobleman to Mr. Edwardes on the 14th of May last. Lord Palmerston has entertained the same conviction. * * * The foreign policy of the government, upon which its friends almost exclusively depend for what is left it of popularity in the nation, rests upon this basis. * * * For these reasons I respectfully submit to your consideration my doubts about the expediency of moving in this direction now. Indeed, should it so happen that the existing indications of an early termination of the struggle continue to multiply, there will be little occasion for further remonstrance of any kind here; for the disposition to help a party once that it is felt to be certainly sinking is not very common among either political or commercial men; and there are no others in Great Britain who would stop to shed a tear over the fallen fortunes of the quasi-belligerent of their own creation.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, March 25, 1862.

MY LORD: I have the honor to submit to your consideration the copy of a letter received from the consul of the United States at Liverpool, touching the case of the steam gunboat *Oreto*, which I have already made the subject of a communication some time ago. It is with great reluctance that I am driven to the conviction that the representations made to your lordship of the purposes and destination of that vessel were delusive, and that though at first it may have been intended for service in Sicily, yet that such an intention has been long since abandoned in fact, and the pretense has been held up only the better to conceal the true object of the parties engaged. That object is to make war on the United States. All the persons thus far known to be most connected with the undertaking are either directly employed by the insurgents in the United States of America, or residents of Great Britain notoriously in sympathy with and giving aid and comfort to them on this side of the water.

It is with the deepest regret that the President directs me to submit to her Majesty's government a representation of the unfortunate effect produced upon the minds of the people of the United States from the conviction that nearly all of the assistance that is now obtained from abroad by the persons still in arms against their government, and which enables them to continue the struggle, comes from the kingdom of Great Britain and its dependencies. Neither is this impression relieved by the information that the existing municipal laws are found to be insufficient, and do not furnish means of prevention adequate to the emergency. The duty of nations in amity with each other would seem to be plain, not to suffer their good faith to be violated by ill-disposed persons within

their borders merely from the inefficacy of their prohibitory policy. Such is the view which my government has been disposed to take of its own obligations in similar cases, and such, it doubts not, is that of all foreign nations with which it is at peace. It is for that reason I deprecate the inference that may be drawn from the issue of the investigation which your lordship caused to be made in the case of the *Oreto*, should that vessel be ultimately found issuing safely from this kingdom and preying on the commerce of the people of the United States. Not doubting myself the sincerity and earnest desire of your lordship to do all that is within your power to fulfill every requirement of international amity, it is to be feared that all the favorable effect of it may be neutralized by the later evidence of adverse results. It is no part of my intention to imply the want of fidelity or of good will in any quarter. I desire to confine myself closely within the pale of my duty, a representation of the precise causes of uneasiness between the two countries, and an earnest desire to remove them. Firmly convinced that the actual position of things in connection with the hostile equipment in British waters by no means does justice to the true disposition of her Majesty's government, I am anxious to place the matter before your lordship in such a light as to obtain the evidence more perfectly to establish the truth.*

I am further instructed to say that, well aware of the embarrassment and losses sustained by the nations with which the United States are in amity, through the operation of the restrictive measures to which the government has felt itself obliged to have recourse in its efforts to suppress the insurrection within its borders, it has ever been its desire to hasten the moment when it might be practicable to rescind them, consistently with the attainment of its great object. But to that end much must necessarily depend upon the degree in which co-operation with its policy, or the contrary, may be experienced from without. It is obvious that just in proportion to the success of the efforts made by the ill-intentioned people of foreign countries to violate the blockade must be the endeavors to enforce it with increased stringency. So also in proportion to the success of such persons in supplying, by violation of law, the insurgents with the means of continuing their resistance must be the delay in restoring to all honest people the customary facilities of trade and intercourse to which they are justly entitled. It has not been without great regret that the government has been compelled to observe the extent to which her Majesty's flag has been abused to subserve the purposes of the disaffected, and thus to continue the present depressed condition of legitimate trade. A very great proportion of the vessels which attempted to violate the blockade appear to be fitted out directly from Great Britain or some of her dependencies. The effect of permitting such violations of good faith to go unnoticed by government is not merely to create an unfortunate degree of irritation in America, implicating many far beyond the sphere of the unworthy parties concerned in producing it, but to postpone proportionately the prospect of bringing about a better state of things. It is for this reason, as well as from a desire earnestly felt by the President to maintain unbroken all the customary relations of amity with Great Britain, that I have been directed to make the present representation. Any suggestion of the means best adapted to remedy the evils complained of is deemed a matter exclusively within the competency of those in whom the decision to act is vested. Dis-

*No order was ever sent out to Nassau to seize the *Oreto* that Mr. Dudley is aware of. (Letter of May 18, 1868.)

claiming every wish to solicit more than my government would in its turn be prepared under similar circumstances to concede, and entertaining full confidence in the disposition of her Majesty's ministers on their part to act to the utmost of their ability in the same spirit, I pray your lordship to accept the assurances of the highest consideration with which I have the honor to be, my lord, your most obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

[For the inclosed note of Mr. Dudley, dated March 22, 1862, see "Rebel Cruisers," subdivision "Florida," *post*; dispatch from Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward, No. 135, March 27, 1862.]

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extracts.]

No. 140.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, April 3, 1862.

SIR: I have to acknowledge the reception of dispatches from the department, numbered 209, 210, and 211. They make particular reference only to one subject, the revocation by Great Britain of her recognition of the insurgents as a belligerent. I have already, in my dispatch No. 135, of the 27th of March, submitted my views on the expediency of pressing the subject just at this time. After consultation with some of our friends, I still adhere to the opinion. A few weeks more of news like that we have received for some time back may dispose of it without further difficulty. On the other hand, a contrary current would subject us to needless mortification in a refusal.

* * * * *

I transmit herewith a copy of Lord Russell's note to me of the 27th, in reply to mine of the 25th of March, on the subject of the gunboat *Oreto* and the agency of British subjects in supplying aid to the rebels. It is pretty much what I expected. The *Oreto* has sailed from Liverpool.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

Secretary of State.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *March 27, 1862.*

SIR: Upon receiving your letter of the 25th instant, I immediately directed that the treasury and customs department should be requested to take such steps as may be necessary to ascertain whether the *Oreto* is equipped for the purpose of making war on the United States; and if that fact can be proved, to detain the vessel.

The charge that nearly all the assistance now obtained from abroad by persons still in arms against the government of the United States, and which enables them to continue the struggle, comes from Great Britain and its dependencies, is somewhat vague. I believe the greater part of the arms and ammunition sent from this country to America during the struggle has gone to the United States.

I agree with you in the statement that the duty of nations in amity with each other is not to suffer their good faith to be violated by ill-disposed persons within their borders merely from the inefficiency of their prohibitory policy. But it is, at the same time, a duty not to punish persons on suspicion, without any proof of their evil intent. It is not the custom of this country to deprive any person of liberty or property without evidence of some offense. If such evidence can be obtained, the laws are sufficient to prevent the accomplishment of their evil designs against friendly nations.

You have not yourself hitherto furnished me with evidence that any vessel has received a hostile or warlike equipment in British waters, which has been afterwards used against the United States. The care that was taken to prevent the warlike equipment of the *Nashville* in British waters must be familiar to your recollection.

With regard to co-operation with the policy of the United States in respect to the blockade, I must remind you that Great Britain has abstained, as far as possible, from complaints of the irregularity of the blockade which has been instituted.

Her Majesty's government have been mindful of the suddenness of the danger with which the United States were threatened; of the inadequacy of the naval force then at the disposal of the government, and of the great difficulty of blockading a coast of three thousand miles. But beyond forbearance and a liberal interpretation of the law of nations in favor of the United States her Majesty's government cannot go. If by co-operation with the policy of the United States is meant either taking part in the civil war still raging, or imposing restraints on the Queen's subjects unknown to international law, I cannot undertake that her Majesty's government will adopt either of those courses. It would be an unheard-of measure to prohibit merchants from sending ships to sea destined to the southern ports. Should such ships attempt to violate the blockade, capture and condemnation are the proper penalty of such attempts. No authority can be found for any other.

But while these attempts are made on the one side, the United States government have willingly received in the ranks of their army British subjects, who violate the Queen's proclamation, in order to serve against the confederates. Nay, the law of the United States, by which parents can prevent the enlistment of their sons, being minors, has been set aside, to the prejudice of British subjects, the fathers and mothers of thoughtless lads of sixteen or seventeen years of age.

These evils are perhaps inseparable from the unhappy contest now carried on in America. I can only trust it may have a speedy termination, suitable to the reputation of the United States, and conducive to the future happiness of all the inhabitants of a country so lately prosperous and united.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 225.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 4, 1862.

SIR: I regret to be obliged to revert to a subject upon which I have already written to you more than once with deep concern, namely, the

fitting out of vessels of war in England for the service of the insurgents.

The report now comes to us that one or two iron-clad vessels for that service are ready in England, and that Captain Bullock is there with men to bring them to our shores.

It is notorious that while the government of Great Britain have formally departed from the friendly relations which existed between the two countries before the insurrection began, and have assumed an attitude of neutrality between the belligerents and this government, British subjects have become aiders and abettors of the insurrection in every possible way, and that the arms, ammunition, and military stores of the insurgents are constantly shipped from British ports, and those who bring them are provided in every form with directions and facilities for entering our country in violation of our blockade.

This government entertains no more doubt of the stability of this federal Union than her Majesty's government do of the stability of the union of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. Under such circumstances, the question arises whether the government of Great Britain are actually indifferent upon the subject of the relations which must exist between the two countries. Are they willing that, so long as the insurgents shall be able to protract a hopeless warfare against the peace and happiness of the American people, they shall avail themselves of the aid and sympathy of a sordid class of persons in the British islands, to whom the disturbance of lawful commerce and the subversion of all honest interests of either country are of no value when weighed against their own gains from a hostile and unlawful trade?

The President does not believe that the British government are consciously tolerating the injurious practices of which I have complained. But I am instructed to ask you once more to bring these complaints to the notice of Earl Russell, in the hope that the time may have at last come when British subjects, deliberately and wickedly engaged as abettors in the existing warfare against the government, may be subjected to some restraint, or at least be made to feel her Majesty's severe displeasure. The President would not be content without doing all that lies in his power to arrest a growing discontent on the part of the American people, fast ripening into an alienation which would perplex and embarrass the two nations for an indefinite period.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 238.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, April 26, 1862.

SIR: Your dispatch of April 11, 1862, has been received. It is certainly to be regretted that the British government does not see fit to arrest, in some way, the proceedings of the parties engaged in supplying the insurrectionists in our country with matériel of war. How singularly this course contrasts with the generous enthusiasm of those

states which send us soldiers by hundreds of thousands to uphold the American Union.

* * * * *

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 104.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, May 22, 1862.

SIR: I have to acknowledge the reception of dispatches from the department numbered from 243 to 246, both inclusive, and also of two printed circulars dated, respectively, on the 3d and 5th of May, consequent upon the recovery of New Orleans.

I am not aware of any matter contained in these which calls for particular notice, unless it be the injunction upon me to renew my appeals to the government of Great Britain for the revocation of the recognition of belligerent rights, its original false step.

I had little expectation of success, but I felt it my duty at once to execute the orders. So, after the forms in connection with the slave trade treaty on Tuesday had been completed, I asked the favor of a few minutes' further conversation on this subject. I alluded to the fact of your reception of my report of our last conference, and to your comments on it, which had just reached me. I told him that you thought the course of events, and the decided turn the fortunes of war had taken since the date of that conference, justified you in presuming that some alteration in the views of the government must have ensued. I dwelt somewhat upon the unfavorable impression that act had made on the people of the United States. It was the true root of the bitterness towards Great Britain that was felt there. All the later acts of assistance given here by private persons to the rebels, the knowledge of which tended to keep up the irritation, were viewed only as natural emanations from that fatal source. Every consular report that went, and there were a good many, giving details of ships and supplies and money transmitted to keep up the war, served merely to remind us of the original cause of offense. I did hope then that he would consider, before it should be too late to be useful, the expediency of some action that might tend to soften the asperity thus engendered. I believed that in your urgency you were actuated by a sincere desire to maintain kindly relations between the two countries, and to that end you labored to procure the removal of this unlucky obstruction. I certainly acted in that spirit myself.

His lordship replied by saying that he did not see his way to any change of policy at present. We seemed to be going on so fast ourselves that the question might settle itself before a great while.

I said that I should be sorry to have that result happen before any action had been taken here; for, after it, we should scarcely attach value to what seemed a mere form.

His lordship remarked that the insurrection had certainly been a very formidable one. It embraced a great territory and a numerous population. The very magnitude of the means used to suppress it proved its nature. Under these circumstances the government had sought to remain perfectly neutral. It would lean to neither side. The wishes of

the federal authorities had been that it should aid them, which would have been a departure from that line of policy.

To this I replied, that whatever might be the intent of that policy, the practical effect of it had been materially to uphold the rebels. The declaration of it at so early a moment, before the government had had any time to organize its counteracting forces, was a prejudgment of the whole question in their favor. The people of the United States felt as if the putting the two sides on an equality was in the nature of a standing insult to them. And the manifest eagerness of influential parties in Great Britain to expedite all the means necessary to induce the misguided people to persevere in their undertaking was like the continual application of a nettle to flesh already raw.

His lordship then fell back upon the same argument to which he has resorted in his note to me of the 17th instant, in answer to my previous remonstrances against these movements, a copy of which goes out with this dispatch. He said that large supplies of similar materials had been obtained here on the part of the United States, which had been freely transported and effectively used against the insurgents.

I answered by admitting that at one time a quantity of arms and military stores had been purchased here as a purely commercial transaction for the use of the federal army; but that I had early objected to this practice, for the reason that it prevented me from pressing my remonstrances against a very different class of operations carried on by friends and sympathizers with the rebels in this island, and it had been discontinued. We had, indeed, purchased largely in Austria, but that government had never given any countenance to the insurgents.

His lordship observed that that government had no commercial interests pressing upon it for protection.

Here the conversation ceased. His lordship said that I had fully acquitted myself of my duty, and I took my leave.

There was another topic touched prior to the commencement of this one, to which I shall advert in another dispatch.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

Secretary of State,

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, May 17, 1862.

SIR: I do not wish to prolong this correspondence, and shall only make one remark in answer to your last letter.

If the British government, by virtue of the prerogative of the Crown, or by authority of Parliament, had prohibited and could have prevented the conveyance in British merchant ships of arms and ammunition to the Confederate States, and had allowed the transport of such contraband of war to New York and to other federal ports, her Majesty's government would have departed from the neutral position they have assumed and maintained.

If, on the other hand, her Majesty's government had prohibited and could have prevented the transport of arms and ammunition to both the contending parties, they would have deprived the United States of a great part of the means by which they have carried on the war. The arms

and ammunition received from Great Britain, as well as from other neutral countries, have enabled the United States to fit out the formidable armies now engaged in carrying on the war against the southern States, while by means of the blockade established by the federal government the southern States have been deprived of similar advantages.

The impartial observance of neutral obligations by her Majesty's government has thus been exceedingly advantageous to the cause of the more powerful of the two contending parties.

I have the honor to be, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,
RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 266.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 2, 1862.

SIR: The arrival of your dispatch No. 159 has been already acknowledged. The Japanese ambassadors seem to have interrupted a very interesting conversation between yourself and Earl Russell on the subject of the relations existing between this country and Great Britain. I cannot but think that if it had been continued it would have been closed with beneficial results. I hope that Japan may have gained an equivalent for our loss resulting from the interruption. Some materials for enforcing the views you so justly presented with so much energy and so much candor in that interview have already been sent forward to you. There has just now fallen into our hands a very extraordinary document, being a report made by Caleb Huse, who calls himself a captain of artillery, and who is an agent of the insurgents in Europe, to the chief of the artillery of the war department of the insurgents. It recites purchases of arms, munitions of war, and military supplies, which have been shipped by him in England and elsewhere, in the mad attempt to overthrow the federal Union. It reveals enough to show that the complaints you have made to Earl Russell fell infinitely short of the real abuses of neutrality which have been committed in Great Britain in the very face of her Majesty's government. The revolution is now approaching its end, and it is just at this moment that the proof becomes irresistible that, if it had been successful, its success would have been due to the aid and assistance it derived from the people of Great Britain, notwithstanding the appeals and remonstrances of this government.

The President of the United States has persistently expressed his anxiety throughout the whole distempered period which we have passed that it might end in the preservation of friendly and cordial relations with all the states with which we have heretofore lived in amity, and especially with Great Britain. Whoever shall read the document I now send you will not wonder that the President thinks it desirable that the government of Great Britain should consider, before the war closes, what are likely to be the sentiments of the two nations in regard to each other after that event shall have occurred.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Huse to Mr. Gorgas.

LIVERPOOL, April 1, 1862.

MAJOR: I have had great difficulties to contend with in shipping the field artillery, which, as I previously informed you, I should soon send from Hamburg.

Messrs. Fraser, Trenholm & Co., of this city, placed at my disposal a fine ship, the *Bahama*, which I supposed would take all the batteries. It is found, however, that the cargo is so difficult to stow that but six or seven batteries can be taken on board the *Bahama*. I went to Hamburg to superintend in person the shipment, but finding soon after my arrival that every step I took was watched by spies sent from London by the United States minister, as well as by the United States consulate in Hamburg, and learning that this consul had declared publicly that the ship, being known to have confederate government property on board, would be captured, after taking legal advice, and carefully considering the matter, I determined to leave Hamburg and endeavor to dispose of the business to some purchaser of such merchandise in England.

I accordingly came to this country, and sold the whole ten batteries to Captain Blakely, late of the royal artillery, who is now engaged in the manufacture of artillery. He is now in Hamburg, attending to the shipping of the batteries.

Just after my arrival in England I received a telegram from Hamburg informing me that one of the lighters from which the *Bahama* was receiving her cargo had been run into by a British steamer under charge of a Hamburg pilot, and sunk with eight pieces and carriages, &c., on board.

There are reasons for thinking that the pilot was bribed to commit the act, and, the inhabitants of Hamburg being unanimously opposed to the confederacy, it is probable that it will be impossible for me to recover any damages. I have had the satisfaction, however, this morning of receiving a telegram from Captain Blakely informing me that the lighter had been raised, and, the water being fresh, the carriages are not materially injured.

Immediately on my arrival in England I set about obtaining a ship to take the remainder of the batteries left by the *Bahama*, and such other articles as might be ready. I have the satisfaction of being able to inform you that I have succeeded in engaging the steamship *Melita* for this work, and that she leaves Liverpool to-day for Hamburg. From Hamburg she will proceed to London, and there take on board the following articles: About 10,000 rifles, 2,000 barrels powder, 5,000 sets accoutrements, 5,000 knapsacks, 300 cavalry swords, 10,000 yards light blue cloth, 3,000 pairs shoes, 6,000 bayonet scabbards, 1,000 cavalry belts, 250 saddles, &c., complete.

In addition to the above I have had offered to me 50,000 pairs of French shoes and 25,000 shirts, (cotton.) If the holder of these shoes and shirts will take my order on the confederate treasury, payable in the confederacy, in payment for them, I shall purchase them. The shoes are of the French army pattern, and although not by any means equal to shoes that I have purchased in England, still I have thought that they would be serviceable, and that possibly they might be much wanted by the army.

I have previously informed you that I have had reason to be entirely satisfied with the London Armory Company in all transactions that I have had with them. The rifles manufactured by this company are so

far superior to those obtained from almost every other source, and possessing, moreover, the advantage of being interchangeable, I have requested the chairman to hand me a tender for supplying 40,000 rifles from their manufactory. Inclosed I have the honor to submit a copy of their proposition.

In case the department should desire me to make this contract I beg to be informed at the earliest moment, as otherwise I may find it impossible to arrange the matter.

Thinking it possible that the department might desire a smaller bore, I made inquiries on this point, and found that they could make a smaller bore, but not without altering several of the machines. The exterior of the rifle would have to be left the same as at present. It is the opinion of some British officers that the barrel of the Enfield rifle is too light. Making the bore smaller, therefore, would rather be an improvement, in giving greater strength to the rifle.

The Austrian bore is slightly smaller than the English, but almost every other European government rifle is of a larger bore. The Austrian rifle is a very serviceable weapon, though to one accustomed to Enfield and Springfield arms they have a very rough appearance. I am in a position to purchase 20,000 to 30,000 Austrian rifles at about 40 shillings each, say \$10. At present I am not in a position, as regards funds, to make the purchase, inasmuch as I owe at least \$100,000 more than I have the means of paying. I have thought it necessary, in the discharge of my duty, to press the credit of the confederacy as far as possible without endangering its good name, but I must now limit myself to the contracts already made.

I must pay my debts before doing anything more. As soon, however, as money sufficient for the purpose is received, I shall at once invest it (unless I receive orders to the contrary) in four batteries of Austrian rifled field artillery, 32 guns suitable for gun cotton as well as for powder, which guns I have already secured, and 20,000 rifles, now in the Vienna arsenal. Unless I should be able to purchase a large number, like 10,000 to 20,000, I should not, without special orders, depart from the Enfield bore, not that the Austrian bore is too small, but because of the great importance of uniformity of bore.

It has given me great concern that I have not been able to make better arrangements for running in the several cargoes that have been forwarded.

It is impossible, as I have stated in my previous letters, to obtain vessels with capacity for cargo and coal for so long a voyage, that have, at the same time, the requisite speed for attempting the blockade.

I have endeavored to purchase a very fast paddle-wheel steamer to run from Nassau to the coast, but I have no money now for any purpose. I should not hesitate to appropriate money to this object, even without orders, seeing how long the *Gladiator* was detained at Nassau, and considering the great importance of these goods being safely landed.

The *Economist*, Lieutenant Fauntleroy, was at Bermuda on the 6th of March, expecting to sail the next morning. As we have dates from New York to the 20th of March, with no account of the *Economist*, I have strong hopes that she arrived at a confederate port.

The steamer *Minna* sailed while I was in Hamburg. It was intended that she should take 500 barrels of gunpowder. I found on my return to London, however, that the powder had been shut out on account of the vessel being full. Had I been in London, I should have sent powder in preference to anything else.

On board the *Minna*, consigned to I. Adderly & Co., are the following

articles for the confederate government: 5,900 knapsacks and boards, 5,690 sets of accoutrements, 1,840 gun slings, 992 saber belts, 4,500 yards of cloth, (light blue,) 1,850 sabers, 5,700 rifles, 300 pairs of shoes, 16 sets of saddlery.

Correct invoices have been sent by the Minna to Nassau.

The Melita will sail from London with a very valuable cargo in about fifteen days.

I have requested Lieutenant Worth, of the navy, to take charge of her, but have not yet received his reply. Should it be in the negative, I shall endeavor to obtain an officer from the Sumter, still lying at Gibraltar.

The Melita is, for a screw steamer, fast, and with an enterprising officer on board could, I am confident, be run in. There will be several large field howitzers so placed that without disturbing the general cargo they can be taken to the deck and then mounted, and with these quite a good defense could be made against wooden gunboats.

I have the honor to be your obedient servant,

CALEB HUSE,
Captain of Artillery.

Major J. GORGAS,
Confederate States Artillery, War Department.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 187.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, July 17, 1862.

SIR: The Tuscarora is still at Southampton. She has been detained by the necessity for some slight repairs. Notes have passed between Lord Russell and myself on the subject, copies of which are hereto subjoined.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *July 12, 1862.*

SIR: I have the honor to bring to your notice that the United States screw steamer of war Tuscarora has within the last few days arrived at Southampton, and that, in answer to inquiries addressed to her commander, the authorities at that port have been informed that she is in need of repairs which will occupy at least a fortnight.

Under these circumstances, I have the honor to suggest that the proper course would be that you should apply formally for that indulgence in favor of the Tuscarora.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

*Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.*LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, July 15, 1862.

MY LORD: I pray your lordship's pardon if, by reason of my want of acquaintance with the proper mode of proceeding, I have failed to take the necessary steps to solicit for Captain Craven, of the United States steamer the *Tuscarora*, permission to make some repairs required by the continued service of this vessel since her departure from the United States. In the conversation held with Captain Craven touching the matter I did not understand him to have learned that the application should come from me.

I presume that the repairs proposed are not of a nature to require much detention. I trust, therefore, that her Majesty's government will be pleased to grant the privilege to the *Tuscarora* so far as it may be necessary to place that vessel in good order for service at sea.

Renewing to your lordship the assurance of my highest consideration, I have the honor to be, my lord, your most obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extracts.]

No. 323.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, August 13, 1862.

SIR: Your dispatch of August 1 (No. 201) has been received.

So also is the action you have taken in regard to the piratical vessels *Oreto* and *290*, and our protest against the perversion of the neutral privileges of the island of *Nassau*. You will, on proper occasion, make known to Earl Russell the satisfaction which the President has derived from the just and friendly proceedings and language of the British government in regard to these subjects. When we consider how soon this insurrection would wither and die when deprived of the sympathies of the British nation and the hope of aid which those sympathies, now so active, have awakened; how soon commerce would revive; how beneficent, as well as how soothing, to the British nation the restoration of our domestic peace must necessarily be; and what hopes for the British race everywhere, and even for civilization itself, are treasured up in a necessary harmony and co-operation of the distinct families of that race, found on every continent and on so many islands, it seems impossible to account for the hostile disposition of a portion of the British people toward the United States, except on the ground of an unnecessary jealousy, which is feeding an unwise and unnatural ambition.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 1, 1863, p. 16.]

No. 21.

Mr. Stuart to Earl Russell.

[Extract.]

WASHINGTON, August 16, 1862.

I had an interview this morning with Mr. Seward, when, as instructed by your lordship in your dispatch of the 2d instant, I represented to him the danger of disputes which would probably ensue, should the United States government carry into effect the intention which Mr. Adams has announced to your lordship of issuing letters of marque with a view of checking depredations on United States commerce by cruisers of the so-styled Confederate States.

Mr. Seward answered that in consequence of the late friendly act of her Majesty's government, or of the British authorities at Nassau, in seizing the steamship Oreto, and in the expectation that her Majesty's government would pursue the same course with regard to other vessels which were fitting out in British ports for a similar purpose, a recourse to letters of marque would not for the present be resorted to, although he could not assure me that such a measure might not hereafter be found necessary.

He also alluded to the case of the other steamer* which had lately escaped from Liverpool, and I explained to him that in that case, as well as in that of the Oreto, her Majesty's government had done all which they legally could do, and that they would do the same in future, whenever proofs could be furnished that vessels were being equipped in British ports in violation of the foreign enlistment act, or of the Queen's proclamation of neutrality.

After some conversation, on his side upon the difficulty of producing proofs in such cases, and on mine upon the impossibility of acting on mere suspicions, Mr. Seward gave me the assurance that the idea of letters of marque was at any rate suspended for the present; and he added that he hoped that the great additions which are being made to the United States navy would soon be sufficiently completed to render the measure altogether unnecessary.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 336.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, September 8, 1862.

SIR: * * * * * * *

We hear, officially and unofficially, of great naval preparations which are on foot in British and other foreign ports, under cover of neutrality, to give to the insurgents a naval force. Among these reports is one that a naval armament is fitting out in England to lay New York under contribution. I think that the vigor of our naval department in building a navy upon a sudden emergency can hardly be surpassed; nevertheless, its progress seems slow to us under the circumstances.

* The "Alabama."

In addition to the monitor and other iron vessels, already known to you, we have the Ironsides now ready for duty, and a new monitor is expected to be put into service within the next ten days. Others will soon follow, and we are doing what we can to be prepared for every possible adverse contingency that can affect the situation of the country either at home or abroad. We cannot but regret that the course of administration in Great Britain is such as to render our relations with that country a source of constant and serious apprehension. But it is not perceived here what more can be done than we are doing to preserve an international peace, which, perhaps, cannot be sufficiently valued until, without fault on our part, it shall have been broken.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 340.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, September 13, 1862.

SIR: Mr. Morse, our indefatigable consul at London, has transmitted to this department an intercepted letter written by S. H. Mallory, who is the pretended secretary of the navy to the insurrectionary party of the South, and addressed to James H. North, who is called a commander in that navy. The letter shows that at least two steamers, the *Oreto* [the *Alabama*!] and the *Florida*, have been actually built, fitted up in England for the insurgents, and dispatched with armaments and military stores from British ports to make war upon the United States. Mr. Morse has informed me that he intended to submit the letter to you, and it is probable that you will have taken a copy of it. For greater certainty, however, a copy is sent you with this dispatch. It is thought expedient that you give a copy of it to Earl Russell. Hitherto the British authorities have failed to prevent such transactions, assigning as the reason a want of authentic evidence of the illegal character and purposes of the vessels which you have denounced. It will perhaps be useful to give the government this unquestionable evidence of the infraction of the neutrality laws, in the very two cases of which you have already complained without success. Although these two vessels are now beyond the reach of British authority, the evidence which shows that they ought to have been detained may possibly lend some probability to new complaints in regard to other vessels of a similar character now being built in England.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[For inclosure, see "Rebel Cruisers," subdivision "*Florida*," *post*; dispatch from Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward, No. 238, of October 10, 1862.]

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 237.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, October 10, 1862.

SIR:

Of this plan, the naval portion, a consciousness of the existence of

which is so singularly betrayed by Mr. Gladstone, is far the most important to us in connection with the position of Great Britain; for the fact is certain that the whole of it has been constructed and organized here. Any diminution of our power on the ocean would be hailed here with the greatest delight, for it is there that the greatest jealousy exists.

* * * * *

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 242.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, October 16, 1862.

SIR: I now transmit copies of further notes on the subject of the gunboat 290, in continuation of those sent with my dispatch (No. 227) of the 26th of September. It is very manifest that no disposition exists here to apply the powers of the government to the investigation of the acts complained of, flagrant as they are, or to the prosecution of the offenders. The main object must now be to make a record which may be of use at some future day.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

[For inclosures, see same dispatch, printed under "Rebel Cruisers," subdivision "The Alabama," *post.*]

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extracts.]

No. 244.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, October 23, 1862.

SIR: * * * * *

I now transmit a copy of Lord Russell's note to me of the 16th instant, in reply to mine of the 9th, a copy of which was forwarded with my dispatch,* No. 238, of the 10th of October. The attitude of indifference to the consequences of their own inaction under the provisions of the enlistment law is continued, and will probably remain to the last.

* * * * *

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

* For this dispatch see "Rebel Cruisers," subdivision "The Alabama," *post.*

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *October 16, 1862.*

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 9th instant, inclosing a copy of an intercepted letter which you had received from the United States government, being the further evidence with regard to the gunboat No. 290, to which you alluded in your previous communication to me of the 30th ultimo; and with reference to your observations with regard to the infringement of the enlistment law, I have to remark that it is true the foreign enlistment act, or any other act for the same purpose, can be evaded by very subtle contrivances; but her Majesty's government cannot, on that account, go beyond the letter of the existing law.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 378.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, October 25, 1862.

SIR: Your dispatch of October 10 (No. 238) has been received. Your reply to Earl Russell's note of the 4th instant, on the subject of British outfits of British-built vessels from British ports, with British-shipped crews, to depredate on American commerce on the high seas, is approved by the President. I do not know how I could add a word to fortify or improve the clear, calm, and energetic protest which that paper contains.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 427.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, December 15, 1862.

SIR: I inclose a copy of official correspondence relative to the bark Maury, a vessel at New York during the Crimean war, which was supposed by Mr. Crampton, then the English minister here, to be intended for cruising against British commerce. This correspondence may be found useful to you.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[For inclosure, see General Appendix, No. 4.]

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 435.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 29, 1862.

SIR: Your very suggestive dispatch of December 11 (No. 271) has been received.

It does, indeed, seem paradoxical that the public sentiment of this country in regard to Great Britain should appear to remain as severe now as it was heretofore, when no symptoms of melioration of the reciprocal sentiment of that country towards our own were observable. The solution, however, will be found, as I think, in the distance that lies between them. The symptoms of that kind, which you describe, have not escaped the attention of this government, as I think my recent dispatches must have shown you. But they have not yet forcibly arrested the notice of the press, while the public attention is still entirely engrossed with the shipment of supplies and arms, and the outfit of piratical vessels in British ports, and with the flagrant demonstrations of the "290," alias the Alabama, on our merchant vessels, and now the reputed escape of the Oreto from her imprisonment. Still the indications of a reciprocal change of sentiment here in regard to Great Britain are as manifest to this government as those on the part of the British government are apparent to yourself. I hardly need say that every care that can be properly given by this department to favor a return to the most friendly feelings between the two countries will be exercised.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCOIS ADAMS, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 454.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 19, 1863.

SIR:

You will receive herewith a copy of some treasonable correspondence of the insurgents at Richmond with their agents abroad, which throws a flood of light upon the naval preparations they are making in Great Britain. You will use these papers in such a manner as shall be best calculated to induce the British government to enforce its existing laws, and, if possible, to amend them so as to prevent the execution of the unlawful designs which will thus be brought to their notice in a manner which will admit of no question in regard to the sufficiency of evidence.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCOIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

CORRESPONDENCE OF THE CONFEDERATE STATE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. Benjamin to Mr. Slidell.

No. 6.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Richmond, September 26, 1862.

SIR: Since my No. 5, of 19th July, I am without any communication from you, with the exception of your No. 2, of 26th February last, which was brought to the department on the 26th of this month by Mr. Chamberlyn, to whom you had intrusted it. This gentleman has thus consumed seven months in discharging the trust confided to him.

Your Nos. 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 are still missing, and for the regularity of the archives of the department I beg you to forward duplicates of them.

Events of startling importance have been crowded so rapidly into the short period which has elapsed since my last dispatch, that any attempt to give them in detail would swell this communication into a volume. I shall endeavor to send you herewith our files of newspapers, which will furnish details, and confine myself to a statement of the present condition of affairs.

On the 19th July the remnant of McClellan's defeated army was still encamped at Harrison's Landing, on James River, fortified in a very strong position and protected by a formidable fleet of gunboats. His defeat has been followed by an order of President Lincoln investing Major General Halleck with the command-in-chief of all the armies of the United States, headquarters at Washington. Major General Pope was assigned to the command of the army of the Potomac, which was composed of the shattered remnants of the armies of Frémont, Milroy, and Banks, after their rout by General Jackson in the battles of the valley, to which were added the several armies of McDowell, who occupied Fredericksburg; of Burnside, who was recalled from North Carolina; and of Hunter and Stevens, who were recalled from South Carolina. This army was also increased by troops withdrawn from Norfolk and Fortress Monroe, and replaced at those points by raw levies. This accumulated force amounted probably to about ninety thousand effective men, and the old cry of "On to Richmond!" was renewed with the usual accompaniment of extravagant boasting by the northern journals.

General Lee first dispatched General Jackson with a corps d'armée of about twenty-five thousand men to check Pope's advance, and having satisfied himself that a small force would be sufficient to watch McClellan, (whose army was demoralized and dispirited by the result of the battles of the Chickahominy, and was being fast worn down by sickness,) proceeded with the main body of the army as rapidly as possible to join General Jackson; but the movement was not accomplished as speedily as was desirable in consequence of our deficiency in means of transportation. General Lee had hoped with his united forces, which were nearly equal in number to Pope's, to crush the army of that general before McClellan could come to its relief, if such a movement were attempted. The plan was on the eve of successful accomplishment when a sudden rain-storm so swelled the Rapid Ann River that it was necessary to wait some days before crossing it, and Pope, in the mean time, taking the alarm, retired rapidly behind the Rappahannock, thus bringing himself within supporting distance of McClellan, who had been ordered round to join him in accordance with the anticipations of General Lee. The combined forces of McClellan and Pope were, however, met by General Lee in a series of successful battles on the plains of

Manassas on the 28th, 29th, and 30th August, and the total rout of the enemy was followed by the withdrawal of their entire forces into the fortifications around Washington; by the disgrace of Pope, who has been banished to an insignificant command in Minnesota; and by the appointment of McClellan to the command of the army collected "for the defense of Washington." General Lee, amusing the enemy by feigned demonstrations of attack on his lines at Arlington Heights, succeeded in withdrawing his entire army from their front, and entered Maryland by the fords at Edwards's Ferry, in the neighborhood of Leesburg, without opposition, and established his headquarters at Frederick.

Again making deceptive demonstrations of an intention to march, at one time into Pennsylvania and at another time against Baltimore, General Lee disposed his army in such manner that by a rapid movement he enveloped the whole federal force of over eleven thousand men stationed at Harper's Ferry, and forced it into an unconditional surrender. The fruits of this movement were over eleven thousand prisoners, including more than four hundred officers, twelve thousand stands of arms, ninety pieces of artillery, and an enormous quantity of stores, principally munitions of war, together with two hundred wagons, &c. General McClellan, becoming aware too late of the danger, moved from Washington in great haste with a view to relieve the troops invested at Harper's Ferry, and on the day before their surrender attacked with his whole force of eighty thousand men General D. H. Hill, who, with a rear guard of fifteen thousand men, had been left to resist his advance, and who held his position with unconquerable firmness, but was finally compelled to give way for a short distance, under the stress of those overwhelming odds, until Generals Lee and Longstreet, arriving with reinforcements, re-established his lines, and repulsed the enemy. The rapid arrival of reinforcements for General McClellan induced General Lee to withdraw his troops to Sharpsburg, for the purpose of effecting a junction with the corps of Generals Jackson and A. P. Hill, who had not yet returned from the capture of Harper's Ferry. On Tuesday and Wednesday, the 16th and 17th instant, General McClellan, with his entire army, amounting probably to one hundred and fifty thousand men, attacked General Lee with great fury, while the latter was still separated from the corps of Jackson and Hill, and had not more than forty thousand men to meet the assault. Incredible as it may appear, our unconquerable soldiers met the shock with unyielding firmness, fought with desperation, although terribly outflanked on both wings, and, slowly retiring, maintained an unbroken front, until the arrival of Jackson at noon, followed by that of A. P. Hill at 4 p. m., enabled them to turn the tide, to drive back the advancing columns of the enemy, and to regain their first position, when the approach of night put an end to the most desperate conflict of the war, each party sleeping on its arms in the respective positions occupied by them when the battle began. General Lee prepared to renew the engagement next morning, but the enemy had disappeared from his front, and left him the master of the field.

After occupying the day in providing for his wounded and the burial of the dead, General Lee withdrew his army across the river to Shepherdstown for rest, and for the purpose of gathering a large number of stragglers yet on the road from Richmond; and no sooner was this fact known than General McClellan claimed a victory, and was tempted by the frantic exultation of the northern papers into what he called a pursuit of the flying foe. His temerity met with severe punishment. On the 21st instant a division of his army, in attempting to cross the river,

was decoyed by a feigned retreat of Jackson until they were too far advanced for retreat, and were routed with appalling slaughter. The river was choked with their dead, who fell by thousands; and out of one regiment of about fifteen hundred men who attempted the passage, but about one hundred and fifty are believed to have escaped. General Lee, at the last accounts, was about to recross into Maryland at Williamsport, and has probably already established his headquarters at that point.

General Loring, in Western Virginia, has just concluded a perfectly successful campaign, (with the aid of General Jenkins,) by which the enemy, after being beaten in a series of battles, with heavy loss in killed, wounded, and prisoners, had reached in their flight the lower waters of the Kanawha, and the remnant of their forces is probably by this time on the other side of the Ohio River, thus leaving Western Virginia perfectly free from any other invading force than some small parties in the extreme northwest in the neighborhood of Wheeling.

Signal triumphs have illustrated our arms in the valley of the Mississippi. My last dispatch announced that General Bragg had commenced a movement which was expected to liberate Tennessee from the presence of the invaders. After a long and laborious march of over four hundred miles he crossed, uninterrupted by the enemy, from Tupelo, in Mississippi, to Chattanooga, in Tennessee. Cavalry expeditions, under the daring leadership of Colonel Morgan and General Forrest, were dispatched into Kentucky and Tennessee, which attacked the enemy at their different encampments and depots of supplies. Their communications were intercepted, railroad bridges burned, tunnels destroyed, camps captured, and several thousand of their troops made prisoners. The enemy's army at Cumberland Gap, about ten thousand strong, was closely invested, its supplies cut off, and they were forced to abandon their position in the night, and are now fleeing through Kentucky, hotly pursued by our forces under General Carter Stevenson, who is capturing their straggling bands as fast as he can reach them. This army of the enemy may be considered as nearly annihilated. Major General Kirby Smith, in the mean time, advanced rapidly into Kentucky, reached Richmond, defeated and utterly routed an army of ten thousand men under General Nelson on the 30th of August, (the very day of General Lee's grand victory at Manassas.) The enemy's army was absolutely destroyed, not more than two or three thousand fugitives escaping from the battle-field. The whole of the arms taken in this battle were used to arm the Kentuckians who are joining us in mass, and no doubt is entertained that that great State is at last permanently joined to our confederacy. General Bragg advanced into Kentucky by another line, and leaving Nashville and Bowling Green to his left, arrived at Mumfordsville, where he forced a body of five thousand men to a capitulation, thus providing arms for further re-enforcements of Kentuckians. These operations, by cutting off General Buell from his base, have forced that officer to evacuate Nashville, and thus not only is the whole State of Tennessee restored to our possession, with the exception of a small district around Memphis, but the seat of war has been removed from the line of the Memphis and Charleston railroad to the banks of the Ohio. We are in daily expectation of the news of the capture of Louisville.

The contrast between our present condition and that which existed ninety days ago seems almost magical. Instead of having the invader in the heart of our country, with our capital closely invested by an arrogant and confident foe, our entire frontier, from the Atlantic to the

Mississippi, with a few insignificant exceptions, is reposing in peace behind the protection of our victorious forces. The cry of "On to Richmond," and of "waning proportions of the rebellion," is changed into a discordant clamor for protection arising from Ohio and Pennsylvania, and terror and confusion reign in Cincinnati, Harrisburg, and Philadelphia. No greater or more striking proof of the change of spirit at the North can be presented than is shown in the official dispatch of General McClellan, in which, after falsely claiming a victory on the 17th instant, he actually felicitates his government that "Pennsylvania is safe!" The newspapers of New York, too, are demanding the transfer of the mint of the United States to that city, on the ground that it is exposed to capture in Philadelphia!

Herewith you will receive the president's message and accompanying documents, including the measures taken for the repression of the enormities threatened by the enemy, under the command of General Pope. I am gratified to inform you that some seventy of General Pope's officers, including General Prince, were captured by General Jackson at the battle of Cedar Run, soon after the issue of the President's retaliatory order, and were excepted out of the exchange of prisoners of war, and held in close custody. This wholesome severity produced the desired effect, and on official assurances received from the enemy that General Pope's order was no longer in force, and that he had been removed from his command, the captured officers were paroled for exchange. As I have observed in some of the English journals the facts have been strangely perverted and the acts of the president censured as wanting in humanity, it is desirable that some proper means be adopted by you for giving publicity to the facts. The confinement of the officers, notwithstanding the threat of great rigor, was the same as that of all the other prisoners of war, and no other severity was exercised towards them than a refusal to parole them for exchange till Pope's murderous orders were set aside.

It may not be improper to call your attention, for such use as may occur, to the enormous losses suffered by the enemy during the present campaign, and to which history furnishes no parallel except the disastrous retreat from Moscow. I give you the following estimate, which, without any pretension to exact accuracy, is reduced much below what is believed to be the real state of the case, from sources of information derived mainly from the enemy's own confessions. The list includes not only the killed, wounded, and prisoners, but the losses of the enemy by sickness (which was truly terrible) and desertion:

1st. McClellan's army lost.....	100,000
(He landed on the Peninsula with nearly 100,000 men; was afterwards re-enforced to 158,000, and left with a remnant of about 55,000 men.)	
2d. Pope's army in the battles of Cedar Run and of Manassas Plains.....	30,000
3d. The armies of Banks, Milroy, McDowell, Shields, and Frémont, in the battles of the Valley of Virginia.....	30,000
4th. Halleck's army in the West, originally 220,000, was reduced by battles at Shiloh and elsewhere, by sickness and desertion, to less than 100,000 men, but let the loss be stated at only.....	100,000
5th. On the coasts of North and South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, and Louisiana, principally by sickness and desertion, at least.....	10,000
6th. In north and southwestern Virginia.....	5,000
7th. In the battle of Boonsboro' and Sharpsburg.....	15,000
8th. In the surrender at Harper's Ferry.....	11,000
9th. In the battle at Boteler's Mills.....	2,500
10th. In the army of General Morgan, at Cumberland Gap.....	5,000
11th. In the battle of Richmond, Kentucky.....	7,000
12th. In the surrender at Mumfordsville.....	5,000

13th. In the campaigns of Morgan and Forrest, and other partisan leaders in Kentucky and Tennessee.....	4,000
14th. In the trans-Mississippi campaign, including partisan warfare in Missouri and Arkansas	25,000
Total.....	<u>349,500</u>

In this enormous number I am not now able to state what general officers were included, but in the single battle of Sharpsburg, on the 16th and 17th instant, eleven generals of the enemy were killed or wounded, among them four major generals.

I inclose you, for information, copy of a dispatch sent to Mr. Mann on the subject of a recent convention between the United States and the King of Denmark, relative to Africans captured from slavers at sea. It may be well to have an eye to the movements of the enemy in the disposal of slaves captured from our people, and you will perceive, by the instructions to Mr. Mann, what are the president's views on this interesting matter.

I received, on the 29th July, the *duplicate* of a letter of Mr. Rost, resigning his office, and informing the department that he was about to leave Madrid, and had confided the books and papers of the legation for safe keeping to Mr. Bauer, the agent and partner of the Rothschilds, in Madrid. This letter is dated on the 28th May, and as nothing is said in it in relation to Mr. Walter Fearn, the secretary of legation, I infer that the *original* was accompanied by a letter of resignation from Mr. Fearn also, but no such letter has reached the department. You are requested to ascertain whether Mr. Fearn has resigned, and if, contrary to the inference drawn from Judge Rost's letter, he has not done so, the president desires that you intimate to him, in the manner best adapted to avoid wounding his feelings, that the departure of Mr. Rost, under the circumstances, and his closing up of the legation at Madrid, have put an end to Mr. Fearn's functions as secretary to Madrid, and that his office has thus been vacated.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

J. P. BENJAMIN,
Secretary of State.

Hon. JOHN SLIDELL, &c., &c., &c., Paris.

Mr. Benjamin to Mr. Mann.

No. 4.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Richmond, August 14, 1862.

SIR: We are informed that an arrangement has been recently concluded between the government of the United States and that of Denmark for transferring to the Danish colonies in the West Indies Africans who may be captured from slavers and brought into the United States. We are not informed of the precise terms of this arrangement, and can, of course, have no objection to offer to its execution, if confined to the class of persons above designated, that is, to Africans released by the United States from vessels engaged in the slave trade in violation of laws and treaties.

It has, however, been suggested by the president that under cover of this agreement the United States may impose upon the good faith of the government of Denmark, and make it the unwitting and innocent participant in the war now waged against us. The recent legislation of

the Congress of the United States, and the action of its military authorities, betray the design of converting the war into a campaign of indiscriminate robbery and murder. I inclose herewith a letter of the president to the general commanding-in-chief of our armies, and a general order on the subject of the conduct of Major General Pope, now commanding the enemy's forces in Northern Virginia, that you may form some faint idea of the atrocities which are threatened. The act of Congress of the United States, (of which a copy is inclosed,) decreeing the confiscation of the property of all persons engaged in what that law terms a rebellion, includes, as you are aware, the entire property of all the citizens of the confederacy. The same law decrees substantially the emancipation of all our slaves; and an executive order of President Lincoln directs the commanders of his armies to employ them as laborers in the military service. It is well known, however, that notwithstanding the restrictive terms of this order, several of his generals openly employ the slaves to bear arms against their masters, and have thus inaugurated, as far as lies in their power, a servile war of whose horrors mankind has had a shocking example within the memory of many now living. The perfidy, vindictiveness, and savage cruelty with which this war is waged against us have had but few parallels in the annals of nations.

The government of the United States, however, finds itself greatly embarrassed in the execution of its schemes by the difficulty of disposing of the slaves seized by its troops and subject to confiscation by its barbarous laws. The prejudice against the negro race in the northern States is so intense and deep-rooted that the migration of our slaves into those States would meet with violent opposition both from their people and local authorities. Already riots are becoming rife in the northern cities, arising out of conflicts and rivalries between their white laboring population and the slaves who have been carried from Virginia by the army of the United States. Yet these slaves are an inappreciable fraction of the negro population of the South. It is thus perceived that the single obstacle presented by the difficulty of disposing of slaves seized for confiscation is of itself sufficient to check in a very great degree the execution of the barbarous policy inaugurated by our enemies.

The repeated instances of shameless perfidy exhibited by the government of the United States during the prosecution of the war justify us in the suspicion that bad faith underlies every act on their part having a bearing, however remote, on the hostilities now pending. When, therefore, the president received at the same time information of two important facts—one, that the United States were suffering grave embarrassment from the presence within their limits of the slaves seized from our citizens; the other, that the United States had agreed to transfer to Denmark, for transportation to the Danish West Indies, all Africans captured at sea from slave-trading vessels, he felt that there was just reason to suspect an intimate connection between these facts, and that the purpose of our treacherous enemy was to impose on the good faith of a neutral and friendly power by palming off our own slaves seized for confiscation by the enemy as Africans rescued at sea from slave-traders.

You are especially instructed to observe that the president entertains no apprehension that the government of Denmark would for one moment swerve from the observance of strict neutrality in the war now raging on this continent; still less that it would fail disdainfully to reject any possible complicity, however remote, in the system of confiscation,

robbery, and murder which the United States have recently adopted under the sting of defeat in their unjust attempt to subjugate a free people. His only fear is that the cabinet of Copenhagen may (as has happened to ourselves) fail to suspect in others a perfidy of which themselves are incapable. His only purpose in instructing you, as he now does, to communicate the contents of this dispatch to the Danish minister of foreign affairs, (and if deemed advisable to furnish a copy of it,) is to convey the information which has given rise to the suspicions entertained here. The president hopes thus to prevent the possibility of success in any attempt that may be made to deceive the servants of his Danish Majesty by delivering to them for conveyance to the West Indies our slaves seized for confiscation by the enemy, instead of Africans rescued on the high seas.

You are requested to proceed to Copenhagen by the earliest practical conveyance, and execute the president's instructions on this subject without unnecessary delay.

I am, &c.,

J. P. BENJAMIN,
Secretary of State.

Hon. A. DUDLEY MANN, &c., &c., *Brussels, Belgium.*

Mr. Benjamin to Mr. Slidell.

No. 7.]

CONFEDERATE STATES OF AMERICA,
Department of State, Richmond, October 17, 1862.

SIR: Since my No. 6, of 26th ultimo, of which duplicate is herewith forwarded, some circumstances of a very remarkable character have come to the knowledge of the president, to which your earnest attention is invited.

On the 7th instant the president received from Governor Lubbock, of Texas, a letter, of which a copy is annexed, marked A, with inclosures Nos. 1 and 2.

The very singular nature of this correspondence, initiated, as you will perceive, by Mr. Théron, French consular agent and Spanish vice-consul at Galveston, naturally excited a lively interest; but we had not yet arrived at any satisfactory conclusion as to the nature and extent, nor the source of the intrigue evidently on foot, when, on the 13th instant, the president received from the Hon. W. S. Oldham, senator from Texas, a letter, of which a copy, marked B, is herewith inclosed.

The concurrent action of two French consular officers at a point so remote from each other as Galveston and Richmond; the evident understanding which exists between them; the similarity of their views and conduct; the choice of Mr. Oldham as the party to be approached, he being generally considered as identified with the party opposed to the administration, while Mr. Wigfall is its supporter—all concur in satisfying us that there is not only concert of action between these officials, but that their conduct has been dictated by some common superior. In plain language, we feel authorized to infer that the French government has, for some interest of its own, instructed some of its consular agents here to feel the way, and, if possible, to provoke some movement on the part of the State of Texas which shall result in its withdrawal from the confederacy. It is difficult, if not impossible, on any other hypothesis, to account for the conduct of these agents.

I have, in accordance with the instructions of the president, expelled both Mr. Théron and Mr. Tabonelle from the confederacy, and have forbidden their return without the previous permission of the government. I inclose you copies of the orders of expulsion, marked O and D.

In endeavoring to account for such a course of action on the part of the French government, I can only attribute it to one or both of the following causes:

1. The Emperor of the French has determined to conquer and hold Mexico as a colony, and is desirous of interposing a weak power between his new colony and the Confederate States, in order that he may feel secure against any interference with his designs on Mexico.

2. The French government is desirous of securing for itself an independent source of cotton supply, to offset that possessed by Great Britain in India, and designs to effect this purpose by taking under its protection the State of Texas, which, after being acknowledged as an independent republic, would, in its opinion, be in effect as dependent on France and as subservient to French interests as if a French colony.

It is more than probable that both these considerations would have weight in the councils of the French cabinet, and we are not without suspicion that the tortuous diplomacy of Mr. Seward may have had some influence in inspiring such designs. The desire to weaken the confederacy, to exhibit it to the world as a "rope of sand," without consistence or cohesion, and therefore not worthy of recognition as an independent member of the family of nations, would afford ample motives for the adoption of such a course by the cabinet of the United States, which is driven to a diplomacy of expedients in the desperate effort to avert the impending doom which awaits the party now in power in Washington.

One other suggestion occurs to me, which you may receive as purely conjectural on my part. It is known to me personally that at the date of the annexation of Texas to the United States Mr. Dubois de Saligny, the present French minister in Mexico, and who was at that time French chargé d'affaires to the republic of Texas, was vehemently opposed to the annexation, and was active in endeavoring to obstruct and prevent it. Even at that date the dispatches of Mr. Guizot, which I had an opportunity of reading, were filled with arguments to show that the interests of Texas were identical with those of France, and that both would be promoted by the maintenance of a separate nationality in Texas. The intrigue now on foot, therefore, accords completely with a policy in regard to Texas that may be almost said to be traditional with France; and it is not impossible that the movement of the consular agents here has received its first impulse from the French legation in Mexico instead of the cabinet of the Tuileries.

These movements are not considered as having the slightest importance so far as their effect on Texas is concerned. The answers of Governor Lubbock and the letter of Mr. Oldham will satisfy you how little those gentlemen were disposed to encourage such attempts, while the popular feeling in Texas is best evinced by the fact that she has seventy regiments of *volunteers* in our army. But the evidence thus afforded of a disposition on the part of France to seize on the crisis of our fate as her occasion for the promotion of selfish interests, and this, too, after the assurances of friendly disposition, or, at worst, impartial neutrality, which you have received from the leading public men of France, cannot but awaken solicitude; and the president trusts that you will use every effort to discover the source, extent, and designs of these intrigues, and whether the United States are parties to them. It may perhaps be in

your power to make use of this discovery also by awakening the British government to a sense of the fact that designs are entertained of which that government is not probably aware, and which it may be unwilling to see accomplished.

An enlarged and generous statesmanship would seem to indicate so clearly that the establishment of southern independence on a secure basis (and with a strength sufficient to counterbalance the power of the United States as well as to prevent extensive French colonization on our southern border) would promote the true interests of Great Britain, that we find it difficult to account for her persistent refusal to recognize our independence. The knowledge of a secret attempt on the part of France to obtain separate advantages of such vast magnitude may perhaps induce a change in the views of the British cabinet. I speak of the attempt as secret, for it is scarcely possible to suppose that the action of the French agents is taken with the concurrence or connivance of the British government. If you come to the conclusion that these conjectures are well founded, you are at liberty to make known to her Majesty's government the facts herein communicated, either through the British minister at Paris or by concert with Mr. Mason. It is deemed desirable that in either event you should advise Mr. Mason of the course you may adopt, as it is very probable that the English government will learn from Richmond the fact of the expulsion of the consuls, and the cause of the action of this government, which, from its very nature, is accompanied with some degree of publicity.

I inclose to Mr. Mason, for his information, a copy of this communication.

Your obedient servant,

J. P. BENJAMIN,
Secretary of State.

HON. JOHN SLIDELL,
Commissioner, &c., &c., Paris.

OCTOBER 20, 1862.

P. S.—Since the foregoing was written I have had an interview with Mr. Tabouelle, and from the explanations offered by him, and certain facts which have come to my knowledge, I have become satisfied that, notwithstanding the singular coincidence between his conversation with Mr. Oldham and the communication of Mr. Théron to Governor Lubbock, there was no concert of action between them, and that Tabouelle is no party to the intrigue referred to. The order for his expulsion has been therefore revoked, as you will perceive by the annexed copy of a letter to him, marked E.

It is barely possible, though I think not probable, that Théron may have acted on his own ideas of what he supposed would be agreeable to his superiors, and not in consequence of instructions. The whole matter is one of great delicacy, and I must leave it to your own discretion how best to treat it, after endeavoring to satisfy yourself whether Théron's movements were dictated by the French cabinet.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

J. P. BENJAMIN,
Secretary of State.

[Private and confidential.]

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Austin, Texas, September 11, 1862.

SIR: I have the honor to forward for your consideration the inclosed copies of letters, the one (marked A) from the French and Spanish consul at Galveston, the other (marked B) being my reply thereto.

As the proceeding of the said consul would seem to indicate an incipient intrigue, I have deemed it proper to advise you thereof on the threshold.

I have the honor to be, with great respect, your obedient servant,
F. R. LUBBOCK.

His Excellency JEFFERSON DAVIS,
President, &c., Richmond, Virginia.

A.

[Confidential.]

Consulate Agency for France and Vice-Consulate for Spain in Galveston.

GALVESTON, August 18, 1862.

SIR: Will you be kind enough to inform me *confidentially* of your personal opinion on the following questions:

1st. The annexation of the republic of Texas to the United States was or was not a good political measure?

2d. The act of disunion and of the junction of the State of Texas to the southern States was or was not another good or bad politic taken by the State? And

3d. The re-establishment of the old republic of Texas will or will not be beneficial to our beloved adopted country?

Your answer to these questions, sir, will serve me as a guide in my political correspondence with the governments which I have the honor to represent.

I have the honor, sir, and with very much respect, to be your obedient servant,

B. THÉRON,
French and Spanish Consul.

His Excellency F. R. LUBBOCK,
Governor of the State of Texas.

I certify the above and foregoing to be a true copy of the original now on file in the executive department at Austin, Texas.

JAMES PAUL,
Private Secretary.

B.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Austin, Texas, September 9, 1862.

SIR: Your communication of the 18th ultimo is before me, and contents duly noted.

In answer to your first interrogatory, permit me to say that the annexation of Texas to the United States was a good political measure.

As to your second question, I answer most emphatically that the "act of disunion and of the junction of the State of Texas to the southern States was a good and proper political step."

In reply to your third inquiry, I have to say "the re-establishment of the old republic of Texas will not be beneficial to our beloved adopted country."

Texas has linked her fate with that of her sisters of the South. She will be true, steadfast, and victorious.

I have the honor to be yours, very respectfully,

F. R. LUBBOOK.

B. THÉRON, Esq.,

French and Spanish Consul, Galveston.

True copy of the original.

JAMES PAUL, *Private Secretary.*

B.

RICHMOND, *October 13, 1862.*

SIR: On to-day Mons. Tabouelle, French vice-consul at Richmond, sought an introduction to me in the senate chamber, and stated that he desired to obtain from me certain statistical information in regard to Texas. I told him that I did not then have the time to give him the desired information, but if he would call at my room I would take pleasure in giving him any information which I possessed. He promised to call this evening, which he did, and has just left my room. I deem it proper to give you the substance of the conversation between us, as it had a connection with the subject-matter of the correspondence between the governor of Texas and the French consular agent at Galveston, of which you advised General Wigfall and myself a few days since.

After I had furnished him with information in regard to the area, population, debts, taxes, and agricultural productive capacity of Texas, he remarked that the resources of the State were magnificent, and capable of supporting a *powerful and independent people*, and then asked me *whether I thought it would not be to the interest of the State to assume an independent nationality*. I told him that the people of Texas, being mostly emigrants from the old southern States, were strongly attached to those States and to our federative system of government, which I at some length explained to him. I told him that they never could have been induced to secede from the United States but to preserve that form of government, which was in danger of being destroyed. I further stated to him that not only the affections and sympathies, but also the interests of the people of Texas bound them to the States of the confederacy; that their institutions, pursuits, and agricultural products were the same, and that mutual safety required harmony among them, which could only be insured by a confederacy; that as a separate and independent State Texas would be weak and incapable of self-defense; that we were sensible that we would be subject to be involved in collisions with our sister southern States; that the similarity of institutions and productions, which are now bonds of union and the cause of harmony, would become causes of rivalries, jealousies, and perhaps wars between the States; that in the confederacy we would not be a weak and dependent people, incapable of resenting insult or repelling aggression. The subject was then waived, and we talked of other matters.

But for the fact you had called my attention to the correspondence between the governor of Texas and the French consular agent at Galveston, this conversation would perhaps have made no impression upon my mind; but as an introduction to me was sought by the vice-consul, with the view to obtain statistical information in regard to Texas, and the subject of the separate independence of that State was thus introduced by him, it struck me that it was not casual or accidental. He furthermore stated to me that he had written to the consular agent at Galveston for information upon the resources of Texas, and had received from him a specimen or sample of Texas wool which he either had or intended to send to France.

I have deemed it proper to communicate the foregoing to you, as affording confirmatory evidence to the conclusion that it is the object of Louis Napoleon, and perhaps of other European powers, to induce Texas to assume an independent nationality. The fact communicated by you to General Wigfall and myself put me on my guard, and caused me to be more explicit and specific than I might otherwise have been, for the purpose of dissipating such a design if it exists, and to induce whatever steps that may be taken to be for the benefit of the entire confederacy.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

W. S. OLDDHAM.

His Excellency JEFFERSON DAVIS, *President, &c.*

O.

Mr. Benjamin to Mr. Théron.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Richmond, October 17, 1862.

SIR: The governor of Texas has communicated to the president a correspondence between him and yourself, in which you plainly attempted to induce the governor to enter into some understanding or arrangement for the withdrawal of Texas from this confederacy. This attempt on your part is considered by the president as an abuse of the hospitality of the confederacy, and as indicating hostility on your part to this government and people.

Your presence within the confederacy can no longer be permitted. You are therefore required to depart immediately, and not to return without the previous permission of this government.

I am, respectfully, your obedient servant,

J. P. BENJAMIN,

Secretary of State.

Mr. B. THÉRON,

French Consular Agent, and Vice-Consul for Spain, Galveston, Texas.

Mr. Benjamin to Major General Magruder.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Richmond, October 17, 1862.

SIR: Herewith you will find inclosed a letter addressed to Mr. B. Théron, French consular agent and vice-consul for Spain, at Galveston,

Texas, requiring that functionary to depart immediately from the confederacy.

The president requests that you will have this order executed as promptly as can be done without undue harshness, and that you have Mr. Théron conveyed under surveillance to Matamoras, or other convenient point on the Mexican frontier, whence he can depart for Europe if he chooses.

Mr. Théron will be allowed to make such disposal of the books and papers of his consulate as he may deem proper.

Please acknowledge receipt of this communication.

Your obedient servant,

J. P. BENJAMIN,
Secretary of State.

Major General J. B. MAGRUDER, *Spottswood Hotel.*

D.

Mr. Benjamin to Monsieur Tabouelle.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Richmond, October 17, 1862.

SIR: The Hon. Mr. Oldham, senator from the State of Texas, having communicated to the president the substance of a conversation held with you on the 13th instant, in the course of which you sought to impress on that senator the conviction that it would be for the interest of the State of Texas to separate herself from this confederacy, I am instructed by the president to inform you that your presence within the confederacy can no longer be permitted, your conduct being considered hostile to this government and people.

You are therefore required to depart from the confederacy, and not to return without the previous permission of this government. You will prepare to leave by the flag-of-truce boat, which will depart on the 18th instant.

I have the honor to be your obedient servant,

J. P. BENJAMIN,
Secretary of State.

Monsieur TABOUELLE,
Vice-Consul of France, Richmond.

E.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Richmond, October 18, 1862.

SIR: I have seen the president since my interview with yourself and Mr. Giles this morning, and having taken into consideration your explanations in relation to your interview with Mr. Oldham, and the other facts stated by you, the president is satisfied that your conversation with Mr. Oldham was not prompted by any hostility to this government, and that you are not connected with the intrigue known to exist having for its object to induce the withdrawal of the State of Texas from this confederacy. You will therefore consider the order to depart from the con-

federacy as withdrawn, and you will remain at liberty to reside here as heretofore.

Your obedient servant,

J. P. BENJAMIN,
Secretary of State.

Monsieur TABOUELLE, at *French Consulate, Richmond.*

Mr. Benjamin to Mr. Slidell.

No. 8.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Richmond, October 28, 1862.

SIR: Since writing my No. 7, of 17th and 20th instant, I have received from the hand of Mr. Fearn (who arrived on 25th instant) your No. 10, of 25th July, with its very interesting reports of your interviews with the Emperor of the French and Mr. Thouvenel. I had previously received (on 21st instant) your private letter of 18th September, forwarded through Mr. Mason, this last having reached me in a shorter time than any communication hitherto had with Europe, and demonstrates the great value of the new means of intercourse now opened and which we hope to maintain. Mr. Mason will explain to you the details of the new arrangement, and your best course will be to forward your future dispatches through him.

The voluminous contents of your dispatch, and that of Mr. Mason, have prevented their communication to the president, with whom I desire to confer before answering you. The president is for the moment deeply engaged in military matters, and in endeavors to repair, by new combinations, the evils resulting from the failure of the Kentucky campaign, which has eventuated in none of the happy consequences which we so confidently hoped. The only gain has been the capture of a very large amount of supplies.

I have no time to add anything by this conveyance, but another opportunity will offer in a few days for a full dispatch.

I am, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

J. P. BENJAMIN,
Secretary of State.

Hon. JOHN SLIDELL, &c., &c., &c., *Paris.*

P. S.—Mrs. Davis begs me to say that she anticipates with eagerness the promised letter from your daughter, which has not yet reached Richmond.

Mr. Benjamin to Mr. De Leon.

No. 2.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Richmond, December 13, 1862.

SIR: I avail myself of an unexpected opportunity to acknowledge receipt of your Nos. 1 and 2. They have been read with lively interest, and you will not fail to keep the department fully advised of your conclusions as to the probable action of European powers, as fast as their views are developed, either through the press or other agencies.

The president has been so fully occupied with military matters that it has been scarcely possible for me to confer with him at length on the matters suggested by you, and he has just departed very suddenly for a

tour in the southwest, where his presence was greatly needed to restore affairs and to impart renewed energy and activity to our military operations.

On his return I will take measures to forward you additional means to enable you to extend the field of your operations, and to embrace, if possible, the press of Central Europe in your campaign. Austria and Prussia, as well as the smaller Germanic powers, seem to require intelligence of the true condition of our affairs and of the nature of our struggle, and it is to be hoped you may find means to act with efficiency in molding public opinion in those countries.

When I send you a remittance, on the return of the president, (at the end of this month,) I will give you my views more at large.

The bearer of this goes in part to complete arrangements for more prompt communication, and I hope that for the future my dispatches will reach Europe more regularly and promptly.

Your obedient servant,

J. P. BENJAMIN,
Secretary of State.

EDWIN DE LEON, Esq.,
Care of Hon. John Slidell, &c., Paris.

[For the remainder of the inclosed correspondence, see dispatch No. 322 of Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward, dated February 13, 1863, *post.*]

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 462.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 30, 1863.

SIR: I transmit a communication* made by the Secretary of the Navy to this department, which shows that the insurgents in this country have instructed James Spence, a confederate of their own, who is a British subject residing at Liverpool, to effect, if he can, an arrangement by which gold which they have collected and are preparing to use in Great Britain to buy and fit out their ships of war to be used against the government of the United States, shall be conveyed from ports which are in the possession of the insurgents, but are blockaded by the United States naval forces, to their agents and confederates in Europe, in the British vessels which are permitted to enter those ports in virtue of the treaties existing between the United States and Great Britain.

So much care has hitherto been practiced by the British authorities in regard to the proceedings of such vessels that the discovery of the designs of the insurgents, to which I have alluded, would have excited no apprehension on the part of this government, had there not appeared some ground to believe that one British ship of war, as well as one Spanish vessel of the same kind, has already been engaged in carrying gold of the insurgents from such ports to such insurgents. These grounds, so far as the British man-of-war is concerned, are found in a statement of a newspaper published at the Bahamas, a copy of which is appended to the communication of the Secretary of the Navy. It is sincerely believed by this government that the statement of the Bahama paper is erroneous and untrue. The gravity of the matter, however, requires that you shall bring the subject as early as possible to the attention of

* For inclosure see same dispatch under the subdivision "Vesuvius," *post.*

Earl Russell, and ask for such investigation and such instructions to the naval officers of Great Britain as the occasion seems to require. It is hardly necessary to say that, in the opinion of this government, the plan of the insurgents could not be carried out except by practices which would be a fraud against the treaties which secure admission of British vessels into the ports of the United States, such as the British government would be the last to lend its sanction to, or even its toleration.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 322.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, February 13, 1863.

SIR: The papers transmitted with your dispatch (No. 454) of the 19th of January seemed to me to carry so much confirmation of all the various allegations made in my preceding series of notes to Lord Russell respecting the systematic abuse of the neutrality of this kingdom by the rebels, that after going over the subject in last Saturday's conversation with his lordship, I determined, with his assent, to make them the basis of a formal remonstrance to this government. A copy of the result, as drawn up in the form of a note to Lord Russell, dated the 9th instant, together with a list of the papers subjoined, is forwarded herewith.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, February 9, 1863.

MY LORD: I have the honor to present to your lordship's attention a number of papers transmitted to me by my government as faithful copies of an intercepted correspondence emanating from persons well known to be high officers of the so-called authorities now stationed in Richmond, in the insurgent portion of the United States.

These papers go to show a deliberate attempt to establish within the limits of this kingdom a system of action in direct hostility to the government of the United States. This plan embraces not only the building and fitting out of several ships of war under the direction of agents especially commissioned for the purpose, but the preparation of a series of measures under the same auspices for the obtaining from her Majesty's subjects the pecuniary means essential to the execution of those hostile projects.

That the person named Sinclair, to whom the supervision of the construction of the vessels referred to is intrusted, has arrived in this country, is a fact well known to me. I have reason to believe that he is still here, and actually engaged in the service for which he was sent. Of the presence of Mr. Mason, I believe your lordship entertains no doubt. Of the action of Messrs. Fraser, Trenholm & Co., as agents of

the same parties at Liverpool, I have already had frequent occasion to write.

Taken as a whole, these papers serve most conclusively to show that no respect whatever has been paid in her own realm by these parties to the neutrality declared by her Majesty at the outset of these hostilities; and that, so far as may be in their power, they are bent on making her kingdom subservient to their purpose of conducting hostilities against a nation with which she is at peace. I trust I may be permitted to add, that if my government could have been induced in any way to initiate similar operations within the limits of this kingdom, I should have regarded it as very justly subject to the remonstrances which your lordship has been pleased to address to me on account of acts of incomparably smaller significance.

I pray your lordship to accept the assurance of the highest consideration with which I have the honor to be, my lord, your most obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

Inclosures.

1. Mr. Benjamin to Mr. Mason, No. 7, September 26, 1862, and after the third paragraph all of Mr. Benjamin's No. 6, to Mr. Slidell, from "events of," &c., to "four major generals." And inclosure No. 4 from Mr. Benjamin to Mr. Mann. (See dispatch No. 454 from Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams, January 19, 1863, *ante*.)
2. Mr. Benjamin to Mr. Mason, No. 8, October 28, 1862.
3. Mr. Memminger to Mr. Mason, October 24, 1862.
4. Rebel act for exchange of bonds, April 21, 1862.
5. Copy of \$1,000 rebel bond.
6. Copy of produce certificate.
7. Mr. Memminger to Mr. Mason, October 25, 1862.
8. Mr. Mallory to Mr. Mason, October 26, 1862.
9. Geo. N. Sanders to Reid Sanders, August 25, 1862.
10. Unsigned letter to Mr. Mallory.
11. Note implicating W. S. Lindsay and others.
12. Mr. Mallory to Mr. Memminger, October 27, 1862.
13. Mr. Memminger to Mr. Mallory, October 30, 1862.
14. Mr. Mallory to Mr. Mason, October 30, 1862.
15. Mr. Memminger to Fraser, Trenholm & Co., October 21, 1862.
16. Mr. Memminger to James Spence, Liverpool, October 21, 1862.
17. Mr. Memminger to Fraser, Trenholm & Co., October 24, 1862.
18. Same to same, October 28, 1862.
19. Mr. St. John to Mr. Smith, October 28, 1862.

Mr. Benjamin to Mr. Mason.

No. 1.

No. 7.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Richmond, September 26, 1862.

SIR: Since my No. 6, of 19th July, I have received three communications from you, (not numbered,) all of which arrived on the 25th August. I also received duplicate of your No. 11, of May 16.

To your general dispatch of June 23 the number 12 has been affixed. To another dispatch of same date, in relation to a newly invented gun-powder, the number 13 has been affixed; and to your dispatch of June 24, in relation to counterfeit issues of the confederate treasury notes and other southern paper currency, the number 14 has been affixed. I pray you to make your own numbers conform to these, and to notify your secretary of this oversight, that it may not be repeated.

Your Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 are still missing, and, for the regularity of the archives of the department, I beg you to forward duplicates of them.

[Here the body of this dispatch to Mr. Mason is precisely the same with that addressed to Mr. Slidell, under date of Richmond, September 26, 1862. (No. 6 dispatch to Mr. Slidell will be found inclosed with dispatch from Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams, No. 454, January 19, 1863, *ante*.) It concludes as follows:]

I inclose you, for information, copy of a dispatch* sent to Mr. Mann on the subject of a recent convention between the United States and the King of Denmark relative to Africans captured from slavers at sea. It may be well to have an eye to the movements of the enemy in the disposal of slaves captured from our people, and you will perceive by the instructions to Mr. Mann what are the president's views on this interesting matter.

I must again request of you to have communicated to Mr. Mann a copy of that part of this dispatch which relates to the war and present state of the country, as it is out of my power to write to him by this conveyance.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

J. P. BENJAMIN,
Secretary of State.

Hon. JAMES M. MASON, &c., &c., &c., *London.*

Mr. Benjamin to Mr. Mason.

No. 2.

No. 8.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Richmond, October 28, 1862.

SIR: Since my No. 7, of 26th ultimo, I have had the pleasure of receiving your Nos. 14, 15, 16, and 17, dated respectively 30th July, 5th August, 18th September, and 18th September. The two latter were received by special messenger, who reached Richmond on the 21st instant. The two former were delivered by Mr. Fearn, who did not arrive till 25th instant.

The contents of Nos. 14 and 15 are so voluminous, (and they were accompanied by others of equal bulk from Mr. Slidell,) that I have not yet been able to confer with the president in relation to them, and shall therefore defer replying, the more especially as I shall have another opportunity of forwarding dispatches in a very few days.

The arrangements made by the bearer of dispatches 16 and 17, for facilitating intercourse between us, have been approved, and will be continued as long as successful. The details will be explained to you by the bearer of this dispatch, (Mr. George Sanders,) in person.

* See second inclosure to dispatch No. 454 from Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams, January 19, 1863, *ante*.

The subject of a loan, based on cotton certificates, has been fully considered, and you will receive herewith a communication from the secretary of the treasury informing you of the conclusions reached by us after much deliberation. I communicated to the secretary your tender of services in connection with this matter, and he requests me to express his thanks and to solicit your aid and co-operation in any movements that may be made to secure success by Mr. Spence, to whom the government has confided the business, in consequence chiefly of your recommendation. He had been appointed to take charge of other negotiations before the receipt of your last dispatches.

The president desires me to express his approval and satisfaction with your conduct in assuming, under the circumstances, the responsibility of making the arrangements necessary for the success of Captain Sinclair in his arrangements for building a ship.

It is gratifying to perceive that you had, as was confidently anticipated, reviewed your impressions, and determined not to withdraw from London without the previous instructions of the president. Your correspondence with Earl Russell shows with what scanty courtesy you have been treated, and exhibits a marked contrast between the conduct of the English and French statesmen now in office, in their intercourse with foreign agents eminently discreditable to the former. It is lamentable that, at this late period in the nineteenth century, a nation so enlightened as Great Britain should have failed yet to discover that a principal cause of the dislike and hatred towards England, of which complaints are rife in her Parliament and in her press, is the offensive arrogance of some of her public men. The contrast is striking between the polished courtesy of Mr. Thouvenel and the rude incivility of Earl Russell. Your determination to submit to these annoyances in the service of your country, and to overlook personal slights while hope remains that your continued presence in England may benefit our cause, cannot fail to meet the warm approval of your government. I refrain, however, from further comment on the contents of your dispatches till the attention of the president (now concentrated on efforts to repair the ill effects of the failure of the Kentucky campaign) can be directed to your correspondence with Earl Russell.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

J. P. BENJAMIN,
Secretary of State.

Hon. JAMES M. MASON, &c., &c., &c., London.

CORRESPONDENCE OF CONFEDERATE TREASURY AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS.

Mr. Memminger to Mr. Mason.

No. 3.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, C. S. A.,
Richmond, October 24, 1862.

SIR: The cotton certificate forwarded in your dispatch to the secretary of state has been carefully examined, and, upon due consideration of the views expressed by you, and the probable ability of the govern-

ment to furnish cotton, a form of certificate has been adopted somewhat differing from yours. The differences are several.

1. In price. It has been deemed best to fix this at five pence sterling. This form of stating the price has been adopted in preference to cents, because it expresses the rate to be paid for the cotton here, in a currency which is understood to carry a right to its value in London. Thus, five pence sterling would imply a right to receive that amount in London, or so much of our currency as would be required to purchase five pence sterling. At the present rate of exchange this would amount to twenty-five cents. It is thought that this would not be too high a price to demand.

2. The cotton is made deliverable at certain ports instead of any port at the option of the holder. This change is required by the fact that most of our cotton is at the West; and if a large portion should be required at an Atlantic port, it would be impossible to perform the contract. It is, therefore, proposed to issue separate certificates for the Gulf and Atlantic ports in such amounts as can be delivered at each.

3. The certificates are demandable only after peace, and within six months thereafter. It would be impossible to transport the cotton to any great amount until that period. To provide, however, for such cases as might desire to run the blockade, it is proposed that for some premium, to be adjusted by yourself, you should place in the contract an additional clause as follows, which you are authorized to add:

"The government further agrees to deliver the cotton called for in this certificate at any time during the pending war, at any port within its possession, (if practicable to transport the cotton to the port selected,) upon the payment by the holder of the cost of transportation."

4. In case, by accident or otherwise, the holder should omit to make his demand within this period, the certificate is not forfeited, but the government has the option to deliver the cotton or return the amount paid, say one thousand dollars, with interest at six per cent. from the issue of the certificate.

5. An additional formality is added in requiring your indorsement. This addition has been made to guard against capture or loss of the certificates on their way to Europe, and also to give an official supervision there.

I now send, by Mr. G. N. Sanders, one thousand certificates for the Gulf ports and five hundred for the Atlantic. In order to have the payments put in proper form, you had better deposit the certificates with our depositaries, Messrs. Fraser, Trenholm & Co., at Liverpool, directing them to receive the money and deposit the same to the credit of the treasurer of the Confederate States. This will place matters in a business form, and relieve you of the necessity of keeping accounts.

In order that you may act understandingly, permit me to apprise you of such financial arrangements as have already been made.

At your suggestion I have appointed Mr. James Spence, of Liverpool, financial agent, and have requested him to negotiate for the sale of five millions of dollars of our eight per cent. bonds, if he can realize fifty per cent. on them. I have already sent over two millions of the bonds, and will send another million in a week or ten days. Mr. Spence is directed to confer with Messrs. Fraser, Trenholm & Co., who had previously been made our depositaries at Liverpool. Had I known with certainty where you were I would also have referred him to you, and I would thank you now to place yourself in correspondence with him.

I have also directed Mr. Spence to endeavor to negotiate for the appli-

cation of two and a half millions of coin (which I have here) for the purchase of supplies and munitions for our army. I hope that this coin will be accepted by British houses in payment at the rate of sterling in England, less freight and insurance. It seems to me that, upon its transfer to British owners, they could obtain transportation for it on their vessels of war from any confederate port, inasmuch as it would be *bona fide* British property, and in any event the holder of the transfer would have a certain security.

A difference has been made by our congress in some of its appropriations for the navy. Those for building vessels are payable in bonds. It follows, therefore, that a discrimination must be made in the application of funds from the different sources of revenue, of which you will take notice.

Under the act of congress authorizing me to accept produce in exchange for bonds, (of which I inclose a copy,) I have procured a considerable amount, which is stored on plantations or in warehouses. I send you a copy of one of the certificates taken for the cotton. These certificates it is proposed to offer for sale in Europe. They would give to the purchaser an absolute right to the particular lot of cotton, with the privilege of shipping the same, and may be preferred by some purchasers.

In conclusion, allow me to request your co-operation in these various plans, and any suggestions which your experience and observation may deem proper.

Respectfully, your obedient servant,

C. G. MEMMINGER,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Hon. J. M. MASON,
Commissioner Confederate States, London.

No. 4.

AN ACT to authorize the exchange of bonds for articles in kind, and the shipment, sale, or hypothecation of such articles.

SECTION 1. *The Congress of the Confederate States of America do enact,* That the secretary of the treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to exchange the bonds or stocks of the Confederate States for any articles in kind which may be required for the use of the government, the said articles to be valued according to such regulations as the said secretary shall make.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the commissary and quartermaster generals to direct their various officers to receive, at the place of purchase, all such articles purchased as are applicable to their several departments, and to apply the same in the same manner as if purchased directly by themselves; and the officer to whom each article is delivered shall be charged with the value as declared by the purchase, and shall be bound to account for the same.

SEC. 3. The said secretary is also authorized to accept, for the use of the government, in exchange for the said bonds or stock, cotton, tobacco, and other agricultural products in kind, which have been subscribed to the produce loan, or which may be subscribed in kind, at such rates as may be adjusted between the parties and the agents of the government: *Provided,* That in no event shall he receive of cotton or tobacco a greater

value than thirty-five millions of dollars; and the said secretary is further authorized to deposit the same at such places as he shall deem proper, and to procure advances thereon by hypothecation, or to ship the same abroad, or to sell the same at home or abroad, as he may deem best; and to assist these operations the said secretary may issue produce certificates, which shall entitle the party to whom issued, or his indorsee, to receive the produce therein set forth, and to ship the same to any neutral port in conformity with the laws of the Confederate States.

SEC. 4. The secretary of the treasury may, from time to time, appoint and dismiss such agents as he may deem requisite to carry into effect the provisions of this act. Their compensation shall be a brokerage upon the business completed by them at such rates as the secretary of the treasury shall adjust by general regulation.

SEC. 5. The secretary of the treasury may, from time to time, issue regulations for carrying out all the details involved in the provisions of this act, which shall be obligatory upon all parties concerned therein.

Approved April 21, 1862.

No. 5.

Confederate States of America.

\$1,000 BOND.

Cotton certificate.

No. ———.

This is to certify that ———, of ———, is the proprietor of twenty bales of cotton of 10,000 pounds weight, rating New Orleans middling at five pence sterling, which shall be delivered by the government of the Confederate States of America to ———, or order, at the port of Charleston or Savannah, subject only to charges for compressing, putting on board ship, and existing government dues, the latter not exceeding one-eighth of one cent per pound.

The cotton will be delivered as soon as demanded by the holder of this certificate, upon the government receiving thirty days' notice of such demand. The demand must be made within the six months after the declaration of peace between the present belligerents in America; in default of a demand within that period, this certificate may be discharged by payment of one thousand dollars, with interest at the rate of six per cent. per annum from the date of issue indorsed hereon.

This certificate will confer no right until verified and indorsed by the commissioner of the Confederate States in Great Britain.

In testimony whereof, the register of the treasury hath hereunto affixed his name and the seal of the treasury department, at Richmond, this first day of November, 1862.

—————, *Register of Treasury.*

No. 6.

Copy of "produce certificate."

[Here enter the weight of the bales only, and their marks.]

Forty-two bales good ordinary cotton, marked C. S. A., and fifteen bales middling cotton, of same mark.

Good ordinary.		Middling.	
Pounds.	Pounds.	Pounds.	
461	463	455	STATE OF MISSISSIPPI, <i>County of Madison.</i> [Town, or post office, Canton.] The undersigned having sold to the Confederate States of America, and received the value of same in bonds, the receipt whereof is hereby acknowledged, 57 bales of cotton, marked, numbered, and classed as in the margin, which are now deposited at his plantation in said county, hereby agrees to take due care of said cotton while on his plantation, and to deliver the same, at his own expense, at Canton, on the N. O., I. & G. N. railroad, in the State of Mississippi, to the order of the secretary of the treasury, or his agents, or their assigns. THOS. G. SMITH.
437	515	515	
442	488	500	
462	458	488	
428	490	461	
505	479	490	
388	458	422	
508	460	448	
451	442	451	
443	423	458	
438	467	450	
457	468	465	
476	478	451	
443	461	483	
440	437	461	
495	432		
466	466		
433	453		
454	453		
453	9,685		
458	9,538		
9,538	19,223	6,995	

57 bales. Aggregate weight, 26,218, at 84, \$2,204 07.

CANTON, August 6, 1862.

The undersigned, as agent of the government, certifies that the within cotton has been examined by him, and that its character will rank according to the commercial scale as middling and good ordinary, and also that the weights and marks are as described—the cotton being in good merchantable order and safely stored in a covered building.

The undersigned certifies that the price agreed upon is a fair market price at the present time.

WILL. G. BAILEY.

CONFEDERATE STATES OF AMERICA,
Treasury Department, ———, 186—.

This is to certify that the within and above described cotton has been sold to ———, and delivery is hereby ordered to be made to him or his order, with license to export the same from the Confederate States to any neutral port, on complying with the requisitions of the law.

Given under my hand and the seal of the treasury department on the year and day above mentioned.

Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. Memminger to Mr. Mason.

No. 7.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, C. S. A.,
Richmond, October 25, 1862.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of 1st August, inclosing triplicate of yours of the 22d April last, is just received. That of 22d April is now for the first time received, and this fact will excuse the seeming neglect to Mr. James Smith, of Glasgow, in returning him a bond for his investment of £100. The sterling is now worth one hundred and fifty per cent. premium, which makes the bill for £100 worth in dollars, \$1,100; for which sum a certificate of government stock has been issued in favor of Mr. James Smith, and will be retained in this department, subject to his order, and a bill drawn for the £100.

Your letter of the 1st August also advises of the desire of Mr. James Brown, of Edinburg, to contribute twenty-five pounds sterling. I have made the same arrangement for this amount, and have directed a certificate of stock to be issued in his name for two hundred and fifty dollars, as we cannot issue for fractions of less than fifty dollars. This certificate will be retained, subject to his order, and a bill drawn for the £25.

Respectfully, your obedient servant,

C. G. MEMMINGER,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Hon. J. M. MASON,
Commissioner Confederate States, London.

Mr. Mallory to Mr. Mason.

No. 8.

CONFEDERATE STATES OF AMERICA,
Navy Department, Richmond, October 26, 1862.

SIR: Your letter of the 18th ultimo reached me a few days ago. Without your advice and effectual assistance the enterprise for which Lieutenant Sinclair has been selected must have been indefinitely deferred, and you have my cordial thanks for your action therein. Your stipulations in behalf of this department are fully indorsed, and will be promptly fulfilled.

The treasury has under consideration your suggestions as to cotton bonds, and Mr. Benjamin will advise you of the modifications of the form transmitted by you which Mr. Memminger deems necessary.

The speedy completion and departure of Mr. Sinclair's work I regard of so much importance that I must invoke your further aid, should he require it, to enable him to raise funds for the purpose of which I have advised him, and the repetition of which here I deem inexpedient.

The courier who brought your dispatches found a means of communication whose safety justifies their further use, and Mr. Benjamin will probably advise you thereof. The completion of the contract of this gentleman will place a peculiar class of ships, never before constructed, upon the sea in our service; and I shall regret if the treasury depart-

ment shall fail to make such arrangement as will enable him to accomplish this important enterprise.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

S. R. MALLORY,
Secretary of the Navy.

Hon. JAMES M. MASON,
Commissioner, &c., No. 54 Devonshire street, Portland Place, London.

[It seems that previous to the departure of Mr. George N. Sanders for Europe certain legislation of the confederate congress, which had been proposed in the matter of contracting for the construction of iron-clad ships in Europe, encountered the opposition of that gentleman. The following memorandum from him on this subject is found among the intercepted papers. Addressed to "Reid Sanders," it was probably placed by the latter in the hands of Mr. Memminger or Mr. Mallory, respectively the secretaries of the confederate treasury and navy.]

No. 9.

RICHMOND, August 25, 1862.

Any legislation in regard to the construction of iron-clad steamers until time is given me to get mine under way will be very unjust. My detention here was necessary to the perfection of the contracts, which took much time and reflection. The final instructions of the navy department have been issued but a few days. Bunglers entering the European market might endanger the entire scheme. Great skill and diplomacy must be exercised to avoid the interference of European governments.

No one is entitled to my suggestions until full time is given me to carry them out.

GEORGE N. SANDERS.

REID SANDERS.

[To this is added by Sanders the following list of names, consisting of persons connected with the confederate administration and congress. Several of the names, it will be seen, have a cross prefixed to them, intimating probably that they already favored his views, or needed to be still further approached on the subject. This supposition is, however, purely conjectural. The list is as follows, in G. N. Sanders's handwriting:]

President Davis,	Secretary Mallory,
Vice-President Stephens,	P. M. G. Reagan,
† Simms,	Boyce,
† Burnett,	† Garnett,
Hunter,	Miles,
Henry,	Wright, of Tenn.,
† Brown, of Miss.,	Haskins,
† Orr,	Lyons,
Johnson,	† Foote,
Wigfall,	† Pugh.
† Clarke,	
† Breckinridge,	
† Conrad,	
Elliot,	
† Read,	
Matchen,	
Bruce,	
Cooke,	
† Bocock,	

[The following unsigned letter is also found among the captured papers:]

No. 10.

SIR: As I contemplate leaving here without loss of time for Europe, for the purpose of rendering important and valuable service to the con-

federacy, I deem it proper to recommend to you the necessity of my having the co-operation of Commodore Forrest in the plans which have been suggested to you. He is an officer of experience, and well qualified to lend important assistance which may result in the complete realization of my hopes and expectations; indeed, if Commander Sinclair could also accompany me, or be sent out to give his attention to matters connected with the plans I have in contemplation, I am satisfied that with the professional knowledge of these gentlemen we cannot fail to subserve our interests and render high and important service to our cause, both in superintending and constructing the vessels built to cut up the enemy's commerce.

I have the honor.

Hon. S. R. MALLORY,
Secretary of the Navy.

[The following memorandum appears to be in the same handwriting with the above letter, though much disguised or very carelessly written:]

No. 11.

Gabreath & Co., of Scotland, and W. S. Lindsay & Co., of London, are the houses with whom I had the negotiation about the steamers. I request Captain Sinclair, of the confederate navy, to make all preliminary arrangement for the contract by my return. See him first; he will meet you in London.

George Thompson & Co., Glasgow, will make proposals for the construction of at least one steamer. They have the drawing and estimates complete.

Lindsay & Co. will negotiate the naval store bonds.

B. Rice & Co. may undertake enough to load one vessel (Nova Scotia) with shoes and clothing under the North Carolina contract. Turpentine one hundred should bring per gallon \$2; rosin should bring \$5 \$4 bring \$8.

No. 12.

C. S. NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Richmond, October 27, 1862.

SIR: I have the honor to call your attention to the copy of the secret joint resolution of congress, which was sent you on Saturday, and to so much of my recommendation to congress upon the subject of the act as shows the basis upon which it was passed, copy of which was also sent you on Saturday.

Under this authority, contracts have been made with Mr. George N. Sanders by this department for six ships, to be paid for in cotton, a copy of which contract is herewith inclosed.

Mr. Sanders informs me that if the government will fix the price of the cotton to be delivered, he can execute his contract, and not otherwise; and deeming the ships important to the public interest, I suggest for your consideration the expediency of stating the price; and of pursuing, with reference to payment in cotton for these ships, the course you have adopted with regard to the cotton bonds.

I am, respectfully, your obedient servant,

S. R. MALLORY,
Secretary of the Navy.

Hon. O. G. MEMMINGER,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. Memminger to Mr. Mallory.

No. 13.

CONFEDERATE STATES OF AMERICA,
Treasury Department, Richmond, October 30, 1862.

SIR: I approve the suggestion made by you of making your contract for building iron-clad vessels in Europe conform to the arrangements of the cotton certificates sent to the Hon. J. M. Mason. I inclose a form of each of these certificates. Upon the meeting of congress an appropriation must be made to meet your contracts, and the terms can then be altered so as to conform the mode of payment to the cotton certificates, fixing a price for the cotton, and providing for the delivery at any port upon adding the charges of transportation. The only limit to these combined operations will be the quantity of cotton which the government can purchase, which I hope will be found ample.

Respectfully, your obedient servant,

O. G. MEMMINGER,
Secretary of the Treasury.

[The "cotton certificates" inclosed in the foregoing letter are the same as those printed above.]

Mr. Mallory to Mr. Mason.

No. 14.

CONFEDERATE STATES OF AMERICA,
Navy Department, Richmond, October 30, 1862.

SIR: Mr. Sanders has, as you are aware, contracted with this department for the construction in England of six iron-clad steamers, combining the capacities of the freighting and the fighting ships in a manner which will enable them to force the blockade of our ports.

The interests of the country will be much benefited by the prompt construction of these vessels; and I beg leave to invoke your interest, not only in behalf of our enterprises already in progress, but in behalf of this also.

The secretary of the treasury has this day addressed to me a note upon the subject of the cotton to be delivered in liquidation of these contracts, and I inclose herewith a copy.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

S. R. MALLORY,
Secretary of the Navy.

Hon. JAMES M. MASON,
Commissioner of the Confederate States to Great Britain, London.

No. 15.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, C. S. A.,
Richmond, October 21, 1862.

GENTLEMEN: The inclosed letter to Mr. James Spence is sent to you for your guidance and consideration.

Respectfully, your obedient servant,

O. G. MEMMINGER,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Messrs. FRASER, TRENHOLM & Co.,
Liverpool, Great Britain.

Mr. Memminger to Mr. Spence.

No. 16.

CONFEDERATE STATES OF AMERICA,
Treasury Department, Richmond, October 21, 1862.

SIR: As you have been appointed financial agent for the Confederate States, and Messrs. Fraser, Trenholm & Co. are its depositaries under our law, I desire that you would confer together on the matter submitted by this letter.

I have on hand gold and silver coin, (chiefly the former,) two and a half millions of which I desire to apply in payment of articles purchased in England by our agents for the use of the confederate government. We find it impossible to purchase a sufficient amount of exchange for these purposes, and the small amount to be had is at such high rates that it would be desirable to furnish a substitute. I propose, therefore, to make payment for purchases by a transfer to the creditor of so much of this coin as may be requisite. I presume that when the coin thus becomes *bona fide* the property of a British subject, that the British government would, at his instance, permit any of its vessels to bring over the same for him. If this expectation be realized, the coin here would be as valuable as exchange, and in England would probably realize its mint value, less freight and insurance.

To enable you to carry out any arrangement you may deem advisable, Messrs. Fraser, Trenholm & Co. are authorized to make an absolute transfer of the coin, or to draw bills for the same on E. C. Elmore, esq., treasury, payable here, and a copy of this letter is sent to each of you that you may act in concert, and give us the benefit of your united counsel.

I am remitting, by opportunities as they occur, the bonds of the Confederate States, the proceeds of which, when sold, are intended to be applied to the contracts, of which you have been advised.

Respectfully, your obedient servant,

O. G. MEMMINGER,
Secretary of the Treasury.

JAMES SPENCE, Esq.,
Liverpool, Great Britain.

Mr. Memminger to Messrs. Fraser, Trenholm & Co.

No. 17.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, C. S. A.,
Richmond, October 24, 1862.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of July 21 is just received, advising sales per "Economist," and balances to the credit of the Confederate States of £7,121 19s. 11d., and £322 8s. 9d. All these credits, with all other remittances from this department, you will place to the credit of the treasurer of the Confederate States, subject to his draft. The course of business at the treasury is to draw on the depositaries in favor of third parties. When these parties are creditors, the payment to them being vouched, ends the matter. When the third party is merely a disbursing officer of the government, the effect of the treasurer's draft on the depositary is

to transfer the amount to the credit of the disbursing officer, on which he may check at pleasure, he having to account at the treasury for the whole amount.

So, too, when bills of exchange, or any other remittances, are forwarded to you by the secretary of the navy or of war, they are not to be credited to the treasurer, but to the officers directed by such secretaries, and your account must be rendered to them and not to this department.

At the suggestion of our minister to England, I propose to issue cotton certificates, of which I send you a specimen. When countersigned by him, he will deliver them to you to receive the money to be paid for them. You will take care that the date in the indorsement corresponds with the date of receiving the money. The proceeds will be deposited to the credit of the treasurer, and it is important that I should be advised of any sales as promptly as possible.

In regard to the payment of the £60,000, mentioned in your letter of July 21, to Captain Caleb Huse, I am unable to speak definitely until I can get sundry details, of which I will advise you in another letter.

Respectfully, your obedient servant,

C. G. MEMMINGER,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Messrs. FRASER, TRENHOLM & Co.,
Liverpool, Great Britain.

Mr. Memminger to Messrs. Fraser, Trenholm & Co.

No. 18.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, U. S. A.,
Richmond, October 28, 1862.

DEAR SIR: You will please extend a credit to Major J. B. Ferguson to the extent of five hundred thousand dollars, and give him any assistance in your power to make his purchases for the Confederate States.

I have already informed you and Mr. Spence that I have on hand two and a half millions of dollars in coin, upon which drafts can be made, or which you are authorized to transfer to any parties who may furnish the means to make our purchases. This fund, or any amounts which may be realized upon our bonds, will, I trust, enable you to meet the credit herein extended to Major Ferguson, in addition to that heretofore given.

Respectfully, your obedient servant,

C. G. MEMMINGER,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Messrs. FRASER, TRENHOLM & Co.,
Liverpool, Great Britain.

Mr. St. John to Mr. Smith.

No. 19.

CONFEDERATE STATES OF AMERICA,
WAR DEPARTMENT, NITER AND MINING BUREAU,
Richmond, October 28, 1862.

SIR: The undersigned, for and on behalf of the Confederate States of America, will receive from you shipments of niter, to be delivered within

the limits of said Confederate States, and not to exceed one thousand tons, upon the following terms and rates of payment:

1st. For niter delivered at any confederate port east of the Mississippi River, seventy-five (75) cents per pound, of ninety per cent. purity, if delivered on or before March 1, 1863.

2d. For niter delivered as above, but after March 1, 1863, sixty cents per pound, of ninety per cent. purity.

3d. For all niter delivered as above, at confederate ports between the Mississippi and Rio Grande Rivers, fifty cents per pound, of ninety per cent. purity.

It is to be distinctly understood, in connection with the above stipulation, that all payments thus due are to be made and received in the treasury notes of the Confederate States, or, if preferred, in their bonds; and that the inspection of a duly accredited officer from this bureau shall be final as to the quality of the niter received, and that inferior qualities, under ninety per cent. purity, shall be paid for at a pro rata valuation.

J. M. ST. JOHN,

Major and Sup. U. S. Niter and Mining Bureau.

Approved:

J. GORGAS,

Colonel and Chief of Ordnance.

Mr. WM. K. SMITH, *London, England.*

[With the above letter were inclosed clippings from the Richmond papers relating to the war.]

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 8, 1863, p. 13.]

No. 2.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *February 12, 1863.*

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 9th instant, calling the attention of her Majesty's government to an interrupted correspondence, of which you inclose printed copies, emanating from high officers of the so-called confederate authorities at Richmond.

I am, &c.,

RUSSELL.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 505.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, March 9, 1863.

SIR: The recent capture and destruction of the Jacob Bell, with her cargo, valued at one and a half million, by the piratical steam vessel the Florida, fitted out and dispatched from Liverpool, is regarded by the merchants in our seaports as indicating nothing less than a destruction of our national navigating interest, unless that calamity can be prevented by either the enforcement of the neutrality law of Great Britain, or the employment of an adequate force under commissions of marque

and reprisal. Congress has conferred upon the President ample power for the execution of the latter measure, and the necessary arrangements for it are now engaging the attention of the proper departments. It is not without great reluctance that the President is coming to the adoption of that policy. But the preservation of the national life is a supreme necessity; and if there shall be no improvement in the condition of things to which I have adverted, the voice of the nation for the adoption of the last resort of maritime war is likely to become unanimous and exacting. The President thinks the emergency sufficiently grave to justify me in asking you to seek, with as little delay as may be convenient, an interview with Earl Russell, in which you will confidentially make known to him the exact condition of affairs in the respect mentioned, and submit for his lordship's consideration the inquiry whether her Majesty's government cannot think it proper and possible to secure the adoption of some means to prevent effectually the further armament, equipment, and dispatch of hostile vessels from British ports for the destruction of American commerce. The argument, as it is put in American commercial circles, is, that war is carried on against the United States by forces levied and dispatched from the British islands, while the United States are at peace with Great Britain. Though we may regard this statement of the case as extravagant, if not altogether erroneous, it cannot be concealed that it has sufficient appearance of truth on this side of the ocean to render it necessary to protect our commerce by employing every possible means of defense. It is hardly necessary to say that the government of the United States means, in adopting this course, anything else rather than a demonstration upon the sentiment or sensibilities of Great Britain. It seeks only, in a calm and confidential though earnest manner, to prevent an alienation between the two countries, which must be deeply disastrous to both, while it would grieve and afflict the friends of constitutional government, of freedom and humanity, throughout the world. We have thought that we were securing a more considerate view of our rights in the councils of the British government with the consent of the British nation. We are therefore more earnestly and sincerely than ever before desirous to avoid new embarrassments with Great Britain. Her Majesty's government will do us great injustice if they do not understand us as speaking solely under the influence of these just and generous sentiments.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 349.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, March 13, 1863.

SIR: The law officers of the crown having consumed some weeks in meditating on my several notes to Lord Russell, of the 9th, the 16th, and the 19th of February, copies of which were submitted to you in my respective dispatches, Nos. 322, 331, and 333, appear to have relapsed into their old theory of want of power to do anything at all to protect a friendly nation from the hostilities of British subjects who knowingly violate the injunctions of the Queen's proclamation.

I now have the honor to transmit copies of notes from Lord Russell, all dated the 9th instant, respectively, in answer to mine already men-

tioned. I mention them all in one letter, because they differ only in relation to the details, and all equally rest on the practical abnegation of will as well as of power to perform obvious international obligations.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Lord Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *March 9, 1863.*

SIR: With reference to my letter of the 12th ultimo, I have the honor to inform you that her Majesty's government have fully considered, in communication with the law officers of the crown, the copies of intercepted correspondence inclosed in your letter of the 9th ultimo, and which you represent as showing "a deliberate attempt to establish within the limits of this kingdom a system of action in direct hostility to the government of the United States; this plan embracing not only the building and fitting out of several ships of war under the direction of agents especially commissioned for the purpose, but the preparation of a series of measures, under the same auspices, for the obtaining from her Majesty's subjects 'the pecuniary means essential' to the execution of these hostile projects."

I have now to state to you that this correspondence does not appear to her Majesty's government to contain any sufficient evidence of "a system of action in direct hostility to the United States" on the part of any of her Majesty's subjects.

It goes merely to show that agents of the so-called Confederate States, resident in this country, have received instructions from their own government to endeavor to raise money on securities of that government in England, and to enter into contracts for the purchase of munitions of war, and for the building of iron-clad vessels; but there is no proof in these papers that the agents referred to have as yet brought themselves within the reach of any criminal law of the United Kingdom; for, even supposing that they have acted on their instructions, it is not contrary to law for her Majesty's subjects to lend money, on securities or otherwise, to "the persons administering the government of the Confederate States," nor to sell to that government ordinary munitions of war.

With respect to the building of iron-clad steamers for either belligerent government, although this is clearly prohibited by the foreign enlistment act, her Majesty's government do not find in this correspondence sufficient information that anything of that kind has actually been done within this country which could form matter for a criminal prosecution.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[For the other inclosures see "Rebel Cruisers," subdivisions "The Sumter" and "The Alabama," *post.*]

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 352.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, March 19, 1863.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit copies of two notes which I had addressed to Lord Russell, in reply to two of his, dated on the 9th, copies of which were sent to you last week.

You may judge from the tone of them what the prospect is of success in pursuing any line of conduct like that marked out in your No. 493 of the 2d instant. It will be perceived that in one of them I have declared my intention in future to initiate no arguments in support of any further representation I may be called upon to make. I have felt it necessary to adopt this course, in order not to run the risk of being precipitated by the force of the argument beyond the line which the government might think it prudent to preserve. Feeling sensibly the growth of the difficulty of keeping on good terms with a ministry which, against all our most just remonstrances, intrenches itself as firmly in the doctrine of *non possumus* as the Pope of Rome has ever done towards France and Italy.

I shall proceed hereafter only upon the instructions which shall be forwarded to me from your department.

The position which his lordship has taken in regard to the invitation of a loan for the rebels appears to be directly in contravention of the law heretofore laid down in the British courts. Encouraged by the tone of the press, this loan has been announced in the markets of France and this country. Of its success there appears to be much doubt. But if successful, so far as I see, it liberates the government of the United States from all further obligations to facilitate the exportation of cotton. And if the statement be true that the rebel authorities have prohibited the transfer of cotton to any parties but themselves, it appears to justify the seizure and condemnation of it wherever it may be found. For virtually this makes all the cotton remaining under the rebel control security for money furnished to them in order to carry on the war.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

*Mr. Adams to Lord Russell.*LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, March 14, 1863.

MY LORD: I have the honor to acknowledge the reception of your lordship's note of the 9th instant, in response to mine of the 9th ultimo, which laid before you copies of intercepted correspondence, "going," as I alleged, "to show a deliberate attempt to establish within the limits of this kingdom a system of action in direct hostility to the government of the United States." Your lordship observes that this correspondence does not appear to her Majesty's government to contain any sufficient evidence of the allegation.

I beg leave only to suggest that if a direct appointment of an agent to establish himself in Great Britain for the purpose of making contracts for the construction and equipment of six iron-clad steamers, to

be used in warring upon the United States; if the direct nomination of a British subject to act as resident agent for the raising of money to be used in payment of all this warlike outfit, and if the proposed establishment of naval officers in Great Britain for the purpose of superintending and constructing the vessels built to cut up the commerce of the United States, do not show "a deliberate attempt to establish within the limits of this kingdom a system of action in direct hostility to the government of the United States," then must I despair of ever being able to convince your lordship of the possibility of any violation of the neutrality of her Majesty's territory short of a direct attack upon a vessel of the United States within the limits of her jurisdiction.

It is not without profound regret that I shall do myself the honor to transmit a copy of your lordship's note for the consideration of my government. I need not say that the conviction is very general in the United States that the war has been continued and sustained by the insurgents for many months past mainly by the co-operation and assistance obtained from British subjects in her Majesty's kingdom and its dependencies. That this impression has not been founded upon limited evidence, I think I may affirm on the strength of the many papers which I have heretofore had the honor to submit to your lordship's consideration. Having thus far found her Majesty's government unfortunately confessing itself without power to take the necessary steps to interpose effective obstacles to the prosecution of this system of warfare, notoriously established in some of the ports of the kingdom, I shall abstain for the future from adding, through the failure of representations on my part, to the irritation which this state of things is very naturally aggravating among my countrymen.

Should my government furnish me with instructions to renew the subject, I shall do myself the honor to lay them before your lordship at the earliest moment.

I pray your lordship to accept the assurances of the highest consideration with which I have the honor to be, my lord, your most obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

[For other inclosure see "Rebel Cruisers," subdivision "The Sumter."]

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 356.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, March 27, 1863.

SIR: I am now to report the result of my conference with Lord Russell at 3 o'clock yesterday.

I began by expressing my regret that circumstances seemed to be once more conspiring to embarrass the friendly relations between the two governments. It has been my constant effort ever since I came, so far as I could, to defeat the machinations of those ill-disposed people whose object had been from the first to sow strife. But late events led me to fear that at last they might gain their point. Of the nature of the present danger I did not know that I could give his lordship a better idea than by laying before him a copy of a letter which had been transmitted to me by one of many active friends of peace in this country as having been lately received by him from a responsible person in Lon-

don. This would serve to show the nature of the means upon which these desperate rebel conspirators counted to inflame animosities between us.

I then read the letter, a copy of which I send you with this dispatch. It was received by me from Mr. Potter, the president of the Union and Emancipation Society, who writes me that he had had no acquaintance with the author, but that he had reason to believe him to be a man of character.

The object of asking the interview I then explained to be an earnest desire to obtain the active co-operation of her Majesty's government to prevent the danger growing out of these machinations. Without such action I very much feared they might succeed; for I was now charged with the duty of laying before his lordship a frank statement of the difficulties under which my government labored in consequence of the increasing irritation of the people by reason of the successive accounts of the depredations committed by the two gunboats fitted out from here. My best course, I thought, would be to read to him for his information the dispatch on the subject which I had just received, though I was not instructed to do so, nor to leave copy of it. I then, with his assent, read your No. 505. After I had finished it, I added an expression of my own strong conviction that the measure of issuing letters of marque therein referred to was one very distasteful to the government. I had myself great doubt of its efficacy, not less than of its expediency. In my view it would rather be like playing into the hands of the common enemy of both countries. But still it was not to be denied that the people in America felt as if they were now suffering from all the effects of war waged from this side of the water while their own hands were tied behind them. They very naturally argued that if such operations were to be carried on without any effectual labor to prevent them on the part of the government here, it was about as well to let the game be opened to both sides. I did not give this as conveying my own opinions, but simply to put his lordship in possession of the views held at home. And unless the government and those of us who were disposed to preserve amicable relations were furnished with some evidence of action to prove the determination of her Majesty's government to exert its power to protect us from the effects of this misconduct of a portion of her own subjects, it seemed impossible to resist the force of this popular reasoning.

His lordship then went over much of the same ground heretofore taken by him on the nature of the contest and the desire of Great Britain to remain perfectly neutral. He adverted to the action of certain people at Liverpool as of a kind which he had always disapproved, to convince me of which he referred to his letter of last year, which had, he said, excited much dissatisfaction among them. I replied by reminding his lordship of the fact, as shown in the published diplomatic correspondence, that I had endeavored to give full credit at home to that letter. But the difficulty now was that we needed something more like evidence of efforts to prevent threatened evils.

His lordship said that the government was sincerely desirous to do all it could. Any attempt to go beyond the law would only end in disappointment. They had carefully consulted on the matter, had examined their powers, and were ready to exert them to the utmost. He had made some explanation of his views in the speech he had made on Monday evening. He had since received a note from Lord Palmerston expressing his approbation of every word of that speech.

I said that I also had been much gratified in reading that speech. It

would be regarded in America as altogether the most friendly which emanated from his lordship since the beginning of the troubles. Had the same sentiments been expressed then we should not have been where we now are. I must also add that I should be highly gratified in writing home the substance of what he had said of Lord Palmerston. For whatever might have been my confidence in his own amicable spirit, I felt it no more than my duty frankly to confess to him my fear that it had not been shared by his lordship. I believed this was not the first time I had said as much to him. He replied that I had been and was mistaken. I then rejoined that it gave me extreme pleasure to learn it, and I only hoped that his lordship would take an early opportunity to bear the same testimony in public which he had done in his private note.

What was much needed in America was not solely evidence of action to prevent these armaments. It was the moral power that might be extended by the ministry in signifying its utter disapproval of all the machinations of the conspirators against the public peace. Hitherto the impression was quite general, as well in America as in this country, that the ministry held no common sentiment, and were quite disposed to be tolerant of all the labors of these people, if not indifferent to them. Here they were absolutely sustaining the rebels in the prosecution of the war, by the advance of money, of ships, and of all the necessities with which to carry it on as well by sea as on the land; and upon such notorious offenses ministers had never yet given out any other than an uncertain sound. The effect of this must be obvious. It encouraged the operations of British instigators of the trouble on this side, who believed that they were connived at, and so believing carried on their schemes with new vigor; while, on the other, it confirmed the popular impression in America that the government policy was really at heart hostile, and therefore should be met in a corresponding spirit. These were the views commonly held as they appeared to me from the calmest consideration I could give to the whole subject. I regretted them the more that I believed they were founded in a mistake, which might lead to very bad consequences. I should do what I could in deprecating any present resort to so doubtful a remedy as that of issuing letters of marque.

There was a strong and a growing popular sentiment throughout the kingdom which might be relied upon partially to counteract the dangers which I feared. But I could not too earnestly beg his lordship at this crisis to think of the value that would in this sense attach to any unequivocal expression by persons in high authority of their condemnation of all enterprises in violation of the neutrality of this kingdom, now projected or in process of execution within its limits.

His lordship's tone throughout this conversation was unequivocally friendly, and I thought him not unimpressed by the earnestness of my representations. He went so far at one time as to express regret at the failure to prevent the departure of the two privateers. But he evidently considered it as a misfortune rather than a fault, which should be now repaired by us through the application of our "vast resources" to the capture of the offenders. He wondered that we had not done so. I replied that it was not for want of effort. But it should be remembered that this was a somewhat novel kind of warfare on the ocean. It consisted of depredation on the innocent and the unarmed, and running away from the strong and those prepared for defense.

The gunboats were known to be very fast vessels. The great improvement made in steam navigation had given facilities for this kind of piracy never before known, especially in favor of those who had

nothing to lose, and against those who had commerce spread over every sea. I then gently reminded him that no nation would take more chances against itself by tolerating such a practice than Great Britain. A concentrated effort made to surprise its navigation in remote portions of the globe might sweep half of it away before it had time to turn round and lay its hand on the right instruments to use for prevention, and then it would have a task before it of a wide and long chase after an offender swift to escape his punishment.

Having disposed of this matter, I next turned to the subject of the joint resolutions of Congress on foreign intervention, and agreeably to your instructions, contained in the printed circular of the 9th March, I offered to read them to his lordship, or to leave a copy, as he might prefer. He said that Lord Lyons had already sent a copy of them, which he had read. His opinion on that subject was sufficiently known. He would, therefore, take a copy, which I accordingly put into his hands. Lastly, I alluded to a letter which had been sent to me from a respectable person at Liverpool, an earnest friend of peace and good will, urging me to suggest the propriety of prosecuting the parties known to have been connected with the outfit of the two gunboats in Liverpool. I said that I should not be unwilling to recommend my government to initiate any suitable form of proceedings, if necessary, and if with the slightest hope of success in procuring conviction. I thought it no more than proper to present the subject to his lordship's consideration. He said he would think of it, and take advice. Should it appear that any thing effectual could be done, he would let me know.

I have by no means reported the whole of this conversation, which lasted more than an hour. The conclusion which I draw from it is that the government is really better disposed to exertion, and feels itself better sustained for action by the popular sentiment than ever before. I should therefore be inclined to recommend at least a postponement of all resort to what might be regarded as minatory or dangerous measures. In the present favorable state of the popular mind, it scarcely appears advisable to run the risk of changing the current in Great Britain by the presentation of a new issue that might rally all the national pride against us, as was done in the Trent case, and that for the attainment of a very uncertain compensation for our possible difficulties on the ocean.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

LONDON, *March 20.*

SIR: You are doubtless aware that the money received from the confederate loan is to be applied to the payment of sundry vessels building for the confederate government at sundry English ports, which vessels are to be got to sea at any cost, the South believing that the irritation caused by the depredations of the Alabama, increased by the departure of other vessels under similar circumstances, will force on a war between Great Britain and the United States, and thus secure independence to the South, and to the subscribers to the loan their cotton.

I have this view, in writing, from one who says he was the party who first suggested to Messrs. J. H. Schneider & Co. to take up the loan, (all of which I mention to you in confidence,) seeing the tone and style

lately adopted by Earl Russell on the American question, and particularly in his correspondence with Mr. Adams, and the apparent apathy of our government and people. I must own I firmly believe that we shall drift into a war with the United States. A further departure of Alabamas from our ports would, I believe, fan irritation into a flame, and *they will* depart, and *very* soon, unless the most determined and energetic action is *at once* adopted by our government. I say so advisedly.

Can you not take measures to have the subject *continually, importunately* ventilated in Parliament. As the friend of the slave, as the advocate of constitutional liberty, as a lover of your own country, I, a stranger, venture to call your immediate attention to this subject. I know more than I can in honor tell.

Begging to apologize for troubling you with this communication, I am, yours, faithfully,

I beg you, if you make any use, in any way, of this communication to withhold my name, as my social relations with many confederate gentlemen have been of years' standing.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 1, 1864, p. 2.]

No. 3.

Earl Russell to Lord Lyons.

FOREIGN OFFICE, March 27, 1863.

MY LORD: Mr. Adams having asked for an interview, I had a long conversation with him yesterday at the Foreign Office.

He read me a dispatch of Mr. Seward on the subject of the *Alabama* and *Oreto*. In this dispatch, which was not unfriendly in its tone, Mr. Seward complains of the depredations on American commerce committed by vessels fitted out in British ports, and manned, for the most part, by British sailors. He alludes to the strong feeling excited in the United States by the destruction of her trading vessels and their cargoes. He repeats the complaint common in America that England is at war with the United States, while the United States were not at war with England. He expresses his hope that Great Britain, in execution of her own laws, will put an end to the fitting out of such vessels to prey on the commerce of a friendly nation.

I said that the phrase that England was at war with America, but America was not at war with England, was rather a figure of rhetoric than a true description of facts. That the facts were that two vessels, the *Oreto* and the *Alabama*, had eluded the operation of the foreign enlistment act, and had, against the will and purpose of the British government, made war upon American commerce in the American seas. That the fitting out of the "*Alabama*," the operation against which the foreign enlistment act was specially directed, was carried on in Portuguese waters at a great distance from any British port. That the most stringent orders had been given long ago to watch the proceedings of those who might be suspected of fitting out vessels of war for confederate purposes. That if there were six vessels, as it was alleged, fitting out

in British ports for such purposes, let evidence be forthcoming, and the government would not hesitate to stop the vessels, and to bring the offenders before a court of justice. That Mr. Adams was no doubt aware that the government must proceed according to the regular process of law and upon sworn testimony.

Mr. Adams, on the other hand, dwelt on the novelty and enormity of this species of warfare. He said that if a belligerent could fit out in the ports of a neutral swift armed vessels to prey upon the commerce of its adversary, the commerce of that belligerent must be destroyed, and a new and terrible element of warfare would be introduced. He was sure that England would not suffer such conduct on the part of France, nor France on the part of England. He should be sorry to see letters of marque issued by the President; but there might be no better resource than such a measure.

I said I would at once suggest a better measure. Mr. Seward had said to Lord Lyons that the crews of privateers had this advantage—that they reaped the whole benefit of the prizes they took, whereas the crews of men-of-war were entitled to only half the value of the prizes they took. Let the President, I said, offer a higher reward for the capture of the *Alabama* and *Oreto* to crews of men-of-war than even the entire value of those vessels. Let him offer double their value as a gratuity, and thus confine his action to officers and men of the United States Navy, over whom he could keep a control, and who were amenable to the laws which govern an honorable profession. But what could Mr. Adams ask of the British government? What was his proposal?

Mr. Adams said there was one thing which might be easily done. It was supposed the British government were indifferent to these notorious violations of their own laws. Let them declare their condemnation of all such infractions of law.

With respect to the law itself, Mr. Adams said either it was sufficient for the purposes of neutrality, and then let the British government enforce it; or it was insufficient, and then let the British government apply to Parliament to amend it.

I said that the cabinet were of opinion that the law was sufficient; but that legal evidence could not always be procured. That the British government had done everything in its power to execute the law; but I admitted that the cases of the *Alabama* and *Oreto* were a scandal, and in some degree a reproach to our laws. Still, I said, it was my belief that if all the assistance given to the federals by British subjects, and British munitions of war, were weighed against similar aid given to the confederates, the balance would be greatly in favor of the federals.

Mr. Adams totally denied this proposition. But above all, he said, there is a manifest conspiracy in this country, of which the confederate loan is an additional proof, to produce a state of exasperation in America, and thus bring on a war with Great Britain with a view to aid the confederate cause, and secure a monopoly of the trade of the southern States, whose independence these conspirators hope to establish by these illegal and unjust measures. He had worked to the best of his power for peace, but it had become a most difficult task.

Mr. Adams fully deserves the character of having always labored for peace between our two nations, nor, I trust, will his efforts and those of the two governments fail of success.

I am, &c.,

RUSSELL.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extracts.]

No. 359.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, March 28, 1863.

SIR: In transmitting herewith a copy of *The Morning Star* of to-day, containing a report of the debate of last evening in the House of Commons, I can only express my regret that the substance of it should fall so far short of what I had been led to expect.

* * * * *

The result is rather to undo in the popular mind the effect of Lord Russell's speech than to confirm it. In truth, this exhibition furnishes another illustration of the horizontal manner in which our struggle is dividing opinion in Great Britain.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

[For debate referred to, see Parliamentary and Judicial Appendix No. 9.]

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 538.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 2, 1863.

SIR: Your dispatch of the 13th of March (No. 349) has been received, together with three notes addressed to you by Earl Russell, namely, one under date of the 9th of March, in relation to the building, equipment, and fitting out in British ports of armed vessels for the destruction of American commerce; one, of the same date, relating to the *Sumter*; and still another, of the same date, relating to the claim of damages for the destruction of certain vessels by the *Alabama*, which was fitted out and dispatched from a British port to cruise against American merchant vessels.

You will inform Earl Russell that the President profoundly regrets these decisions of the British government, declining to interfere to arrest proceedings of British subjects, within its exclusive jurisdiction, hostile and injurious to the United States. Recent instructions bearing upon the same subject will have reached you after these decisions were made. You will submit the views of the President, expressed in those later instructions, to Earl Russell.

As one more resource, it is deemed advisable that an effort be made to secure the enforcement of the enlistment laws through the action of the courts. Will you consult counsel, and have a case prepared and proceedings instituted, if advice received shall warrant any expectation of justice? This is the President's conclusion upon the whole matter as it is known here. Nevertheless, it is not to overrule your own judgment upon an examination of all the circumstances of the case.

Upon being informed of any expense that you may incur in carrying this instruction into effect, the department will send you a credit therefor on the bankers of the United States at London.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No 540.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 7, 1863.

SIR: The Canada's mails have just been laid before me at the hour of sending my dispatches to Europe.

The consideration of your communication is reserved.

The healthful reaction of opinion here is continued.

The uneasiness in the country, resulting from the toleration of hostile naval preparations in Great Britain, increases, and seems to portend difficulties which will require the exercise of great discretion by both governments. Applications for letters of marque and reprisal to insure the success of the naval operations against the insurgents are coming in, and the question of the propriety of granting them is fixing the public attention.

The public journals which will go out with the steamer have even later information of military and naval movements than any which has directly reached the proper departments of the government.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Dayton to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, April 9, 1863.

No. 297.]

SIR: In a conference with Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys, had this day, he inquired particularly as to our action in reference to the issue of letters of marque. He has, without doubt, recently had conversation with Lord Cowley on this subject. He stated that Lord Cowley had given to him a copy of the late speech of Mr. Palmer, the solicitor general of England, (delivered in the House of Commons,) on the subject of the Alabama and the building of ships in their ports for the confederates. He said the speech seemed carefully prepared (*travaillé*.) I told him that I thought it had been elaborated with much care, but I had reason to know from a member of the House of Parliament, present at its delivery, that it was thought by him, and many others, that the learned solicitor general had gone too far; that he had promulgated doctrines which England would not herself abide by, if we or other powers should, under like circumstances, attempt to apply them to her. I further told Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys our foreign enlistment act was the same as that of England, and that the United States, during the Crimean war, had enforced another rule; that we had promptly interfered, as I had been informed, to prevent the building of one war vessel for Russia, and had prevented the sailing of others. Strange as it may seem, this appeared to be new to him, and he said if that were so, the fact should be known. I assured him that the facts were, as I believed, already known to the British government; that they appeared, in part, at least, in the correspondence between Mr. Adams and Earl Russell; that the French journals seemed to take little interest in the publication

of such matter, and although these statements had been repeatedly made in the American and in some English journals which were received by French journalists, they had not been generally republished here. He said, at once, that this was wrong, and that an important fact of this nature should be made known through the public press. I then told him that, inasmuch as Lord Cowley had supplied him with the speech of Mr. Palmer on this subject, I would make it my business forthwith to furnish him with such evidence of the facts I had referred to as were within my reach, which I shall immediately do. It was quite evident to me that the British authorities had been making an effort to satisfy this government that they were not to blame for what had occurred or might hereafter occur in reference to the fitting out of war vessels for the rebels in their ports. Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys, while not questioning our right to issue letters of marque, seemed, I thought, to deprecate it as an act uncalled for under existing circumstances, and calculated to produce troublesome complications. He begged that, should anything of the kind be done, it might be done with all proper precaution and guards to avoid interference with the commerce of neutral powers. He said that we well knew that the practice of France and her principles as to maritime law had differed from those of England; that they had built no ships for the insurgents, and had not interfered with us; that it was evidently not the interest of the United States to take such course as would create community of action upon these questions between England and France. I referred him to the contents of your dispatch No. 304, as the last official intimation I had received on the subject, and assured him that, should the President feel it his duty to act under the law of Congress, it would be done with all the precaution and care of which the nature of the proceedings was susceptible. That the President would, of course, feel most anxious to surround his letters of marque, if the issue of such should be made, with such guards as would, if possible, prevent injurious collisions or complications with foreign powers. I then again called his attention to the fact that all this trouble came from the Alabama and the course of Great Britain in permitting ships of war to be built for the insurgents in her ports. I thought it well, too, (believing that Lord Cowley conferred with him on these subjects,) to inform him distinctly that the exasperation of the citizens of the United States, growing out of the depredations of the Alabama and Florida, was so great that should the war ships now being built for the rebels in British ports escape by the negligence of that government, I did not believe it would be possible to keep the peace between the two countries. I told him that a foreign war would affect us principally through our commerce, and if this were to be cut up and destroyed by the indirect action of Great Britain, the feeling would be that we might as well meet her direct hostility at once. But I added that we hoped to avoid adding to our internal difficulties a foreign war, and I trusted, for the interest of both countries and the world, that Great Britain might be induced, in this respect, to stay her hand. I trust that he will say this to Lord Cowley.

Before leaving, I said to Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys that I hoped he would apprise me seasonably of anything of special interest to my country; this he said he would cheerfully do.

* * * * *

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM L. DAYTON.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extracts.]

No. 369.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, April 9, 1863.

SIR: Lord Russell has thought it expedient to renew the correspondence about the intercepted dispatches in a note of the 2d of April, a copy of which I send herewith.

Δ copy of my reply, dated, the 6th instant, is appended.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *April 2, 1863.*

SIR: Her Majesty's government have not failed to consider, with the attention it deserved, the letter which you addressed to me on the 14th ultimo, in reply to my letter of the 9th ultimo, on the subject of the intercepted correspondence which you had alleged went to show a deliberate attempt to establish within the limits of the United Kingdom a system of action in direct hostility to the government of the United States.

I have now the honor to observe to you that, while you withhold your acquiescence in the opinion expressed by me of that correspondence, and state that you shall transmit a copy of my note, with profound regret, to your government, you nevertheless do not controvert the principal positions assumed in that note.

You do not deny, first, that it is lawful for her Majesty's subjects to lend money on securities, or otherwise, to either belligerent, or, secondly, that it is also lawful to sell to either belligerent munitions of war.

Upon this subject I beg to call to your notice that no longer ago than the 20th of last November, in answer to the remonstrance of Mexico against an alleged organized system in the United States of aiding France in the war in which she is engaged with that republic, but in which the United States are neutral, Mr. Seward replied by this, among other citations:

Mr. Webster to Mr. Thompson.

As to advances, loans, or donations of money to the government of Texas, or its citizens, the Mexican government hardly needs to be informed that there is nothing unlawful in this so long as Texas is at peace with the United States, and that these are things which no government undertakes to restrain.

You are, without doubt, perfectly aware that many decisions of tribunals in the United States fully establish that a like exposition of the law as to munitions of war and the sale of armed vessels has been always maintained in the United States when they were neutrals.

You do not state that the information which you have communicated to me, as to alleged contracts for constructing war steamers, or the pro-

posed establishment of naval officers to superintend them, would be sufficient to found a criminal prosecution in the United States; you are probably aware that it would not suffice for that purpose, and there is, therefore, no reason why you should complain of my statement that the information which you had furnished would not suffice for the like purpose in England.

You are not ignorant that agents have been employed and munitions of war have been purchased, and that it is now again asserted that her Majesty's subjects are being recruited for the purpose of aiding the United States against the so-called Confederate States; and so far it might be urged in vague and popular language by the Confederate States, as well as by the United States as the other belligerent, (as it was substantially urged by Mexico against the United States last year,) "that there is evidence of a deliberate attempt to establish within the limits of this kingdom a system of action in direct hostility to their government." But the question really is, has there been any act done in England both contrary to the obligations of neutrality as recognized by Great Britain and the United States, and capable of being made the subject of a criminal prosecution? I can only repeat that in the opinion of her Majesty's government no such act is specified in the papers which you have submitted to me.

I, however, willingly assure you that, in view of the statements contained in the intercepted correspondence, her Majesty's government have renewed the instructions already given to the custom-house authorities of the several British ports where ships of war may be constructed, and by the secretary of state for the home department to various authorities with whom he is in communication, to endeavor to discover and obtain legal evidence of any violation of the foreign enlistment act, with a view to the strict enforcement of that statute whenever it can really be shown to be infringed; and her Majesty's government would be obliged to you to communicate to them, or to the local authorities at the several ports, any evidence of illegal acts which may from time to time become known to you.

I have referred, generally, to the judicial decisions of the United States on this subject; but it would be as well that I should mention, specially, two of those decisions, selected out of many, both upon the general question and upon the particular case of the sale of ships of war by the subjects of a neutral to a belligerent state.

The first decision is that of the eminent Judge Story, given, it may be well to observe, in a case in which the recognition of the Spanish American republics was directly concerned. After admitting that the capture had been made by a United States ship, built in the United States, originally owned in the United States, Judge Story proceeds to say: "The question as to the original illegal armament and outfit of the *Independencia* may be dismissed in a few words; it is apparent that, though *equipped as a vessel of war*, she was sent out to Buenos Ayres on a commercial adventure, *contraband indeed, but in no shape violating our laws or our national neutrality*. If captured by a Spanish ship of war during the voyage, she would have been justly condemnable as good prize for being engaged in a traffic prohibited by the law of nations. But there is nothing in our laws, or in the law of nations, that forbids our citizens from sending armed vessels, as well as munitions of war, to foreign ports for sale. It is a commercial adventure which no nation is bound to prohibit, and which only exposes the persons engaged in it to the penalty of confiscation."

This is a case illustrating the law and practice of the United States while neutral in the war between Spain and her colonies.

The next case (historically the first) illustrates also the law and practice of the United States while neutral in the war between Great Britain and France. It is so short that I beg leave to cite it verbatim and at length, as given in Curtis's Reports of Decisions in the Supreme Court of the United States, volume 1, pages 234, 235, "*Moodie vs. The ship Alfred.*"

It is not a violation of the neutrality laws of the United States to sell to a foreigner a vessel built in this country, though suited to be a privateer, and having some equipments calculated for war, but frequently used by merchant ships. The allegation in this case, as supported by the evidence, was that the privateer which took the British prize in question had been built in New York, with the express view of being employed as a privateer, in case the then existing controversy between Great Britain and the United States should terminate in war; that some of her equipments were calculated for war, though they were also frequently used for merchant ships; that the privateer was sent to Charleston, where she was sold to a French citizen; that she was carried by him to a French island, where she was completely armed and equipped, and furnished with a commission; that she afterwards sailed on a cruise, during which the prize was taken and sent into Charleston. Reed, for the plaintiffs in error, contended that this was an original construction or outfit of a vessel for the purpose of war; and that if it was tolerated as legal, it would be easy, by collusion, to subvert the neutrality of the United States and involve the country in a war.

The court, however, without hearing the opposite counsel, directed the decree to be affirmed.

It seems clear, on the principle enunciated in these authorities, that, except on the ground of any proved violation of the foreign enlistment act, her Majesty's government cannot interfere with commercial dealings between British subjects and the so-styled Confederate States, whether the subject of those dealings be money or contraband goods, or even ships adapted for warlike purposes.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, April 6, 1863.

MY LORD: I have had the honor to receive your note of the 2d instant, in reply to mine of the 14th of last month, on the subject of the intercepted correspondence submitted to your lordship's consideration some time since, which, as I alleged, "went to show a deliberate attempt to establish within the limits of the United Kingdom a system of action in direct hostility to the government of the United States."

Your lordship is pleased to observe that I do not controvert the principal positions assumed in your note, to wit: 1st. "That it is lawful for her Majesty's subjects to lend money on security, or otherwise, to either belligerent. 2d. That it is lawful to sell to either belligerent munitions of war." And thereupon your lordship is pleased to call my attention to several citations from eminent authorities in the United States, judicial and otherwise, to establish these positions, just the same as if I had controverted them.

Nevertheless, I have given to all the passages presented by your lordship the same profound attention which I habitually pay to everything from the same source. I cannot, however, perceive that they have any

effect in disturbing the positions which have been heretofore assumed by myself. The sale and transfer, by a neutral, of arms, of munitions of war, and even of vessels of war, to a belligerent country not subject to blockade at the time, *as a purely commercial transaction*, is decided by these authorities not to be unlawful. They go not a step further, and precisely to that extent I have myself taken no exception to the doctrine.

But the case is changed when a belligerent is shown to be taking measures to establish a system of operations in a neutral country with the intent to carry on a war from its ports, much in the same way that it would do, if it could, from its own territory, when it appoints agents, residing in that country, for the purpose of borrowing money *to be applied to the fitting out of hostile armaments* in those very ports, and when it appoints and sends out agents to superintend in those ports the constructing, equipping, and arming ships of war, as well as the enlisting of the subjects of the neutral country, to issue forth for the purpose of carrying on hostilities on the ocean.

These are the points to which I desire to call your lordship's attention in the intercepted dispatches. I affirmed that they *went to show* a system of operations to the extent thus designated. I did not affirm that they absolutely proved the fact. But I did mean to be understood as affirming them to furnish strong corroborative evidence to sustain all the other proof which I have been in the practice of laying before your lordship for a long time past, of the abuses made of her Majesty's neutral territory, for the conduct of the war directly from her ports, without the intervention of time even for the vessels to gain the semblance of a national character.

Had your lordship been pleased to continue your reading of the decision by the United States court in the case of the *Independencia* and *Altravida*, some pages further than the passage to which you have done me the honor to draw my attention, you would have been able fully to comprehend the spirit in which the eminent judge who pronounced the decree construed the obligations of the United States as a neutral power. He condemned the outfit of these vessels precisely for the reason above assigned.

Neither is that case the only or the most significant expression of the duties incumbent on the government of the United States towards nations with which it is in amity in a similar emergency. Since your lordship is pleased to accord so much weight to the decisions of the courts, I would respectfully solicit your attention to the case of the United States against John D. Quincy, (6 Peter's Reports, pp. 445-468,) as giving a full construction of the powers given to it for the protection of foreign countries by the enlistment law. So far as I may be permitted to express an opinion, it clearly embraces within its scope the objects and purposes declared in the intercepted dispatches.

But I must pray your lordship's pardon for thus encroaching on your valuable time with any further discussion of these points. In doing so, I am conscious of having varied from the intentions heretofore expressed of abstaining from it, unless prompted by the authority of instructions. I shall do myself the honor to transmit to my government a copy of your note, and I entertain no doubt that it will receive with satisfaction the assurance your lordship is pleased to give of a determination of her Majesty's government, "in view of the statements contained in the intercepted correspondence," to endeavor to discover and obtain legal evidence of any violation of the enlistment act with a view to the strict enforcement of it whenever it can really be shown to be infringed. I trust I

need not add the assurance that all the efforts of myself, as well as of the various officers of my government within this kingdom, will be at the service of the local authorities at the several ports in prosecuting these investigations.

I pray your lordship, &c.,

CHARLES FRANCOIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. Earl RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 370.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, April 9, 1863.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit copies of three notes which passed between Lord Russell and myself, in continuation of the correspondence referred to in my dispatch No. 362, of the 3d instant.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Lord Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, April 6, 1863.

MY LORD: I have the honor to acknowledge the reception of notes from your lordship, dated the 27th and 31st of March, and two on the 3d of April, in reply to certain representations of mine concerning vessels believed to be in preparation at Liverpool for the carrying on of hostilities at sea against the commerce of the United States. It is a source of great satisfaction to me to recognize the readiness which her Majesty's government has thus manifested to make the investigations desired, as well as to receive the assurances of its determination to maintain a close observation of future movements of an unusual character, that justify suspicions of any evil intent.

I pray your lordship to accept the assurances of the highest consideration with which I have the honor to be, my lord, your most obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCOIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

[For remaining inclosures see same dispatch under "Alexandra" and "Phantom" subdivisions, *post.*]

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 545.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 10, 1863.

SIR: It is thought expedient that the most direct and energetic measures should be adopted to arrest by judicial proceedings the clearance

38 A C—VOL. I

and departure of the hostile vessels which are being built, equipped, and manned in the ports of Great Britain. You will therefore sanction and authorize such prosecutions whenever, upon legal advice, it shall seem expedient.

This government has heard with surprise and regret that a loan has been made in London to the insurgents, with conditions of security and payment openly hostile to the United States; and it has good reason for assuming that most or all of the moneys thus loaned are paid to British subjects residing in Great Britain for advances in money, labor, arms, military stores, and supplies used in the fitting out of those hostile expeditions, in violation of the Queen's proclamation and of the enlistment acts of Great Britain, as well as of treaties and the law of nations. The President does not for a moment believe that her Majesty's government have lent or will lend any sanction or approval to these proceedings of her Majesty's subjects; but he regrets that he is unable to perceive that any part of those transactions, so inimical to the United States and apparently so universally known in Great Britain, have arrested the attention of her Majesty's government, or encountered any opposition, or even any manifestation of its disapprobation or censure.

The loan made by European capitalists is a direct engagement with the armed insurgents who have assumed to control, supply, and deliver cotton for the reimbursement of the money advanced, with interest. You will give notice to Earl Russell that this transaction necessarily brings to an end all concessions, of whatever form, that have been made by this government for mitigating or alleviating the rigor of the blockade in regard to the shipment of cotton and tobacco. Nor will any title of any person, whether citizen of the United States or subject of a foreign power, to any cotton or merchandise, which title is derived from or through any pretended insurgent authority or other agency hostile to the United States, be respected by this government.

It would be to evince a want of frankness and good faith if we should fail to inform Great Britain that in this country the proceedings to which I have referred have come to be regarded, equally by the people and the government, as tending to complicate the relations between the two countries in such a manner as to render it difficult, if not altogether impossible, to maintain and preserve friendship between them; a result which the President believes is as far from being desired by Great Britain as it is from being the policy or the wish of the United States. After the resort to the courts of the United Kingdom which the President has specially authorized as a sequel to the applications and remonstrances which you have made, thus far without any effective result, this government is not now aware of any other measures remaining within its power to arrest the tendency I have described and to avert the calamities I have deprecated. If it be in the power of the British government to suggest anything further that it may be thought possible and proper for the United States to do with that view, the suggestion will be received and considered with the utmost candor and respect.

You will, in such manner as shall seem most proper, bring these views to the knowledge of her Majesty's government.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 546.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 10, 1863.

SIR: Your dispatch of the 19th of March, No. 352, has been received. It is not doubted at all that you can judge more wisely in your place in London than we can in our place here, in what form and to what extent the remonstrance which we feel ourselves entitled to make against the seeming toleration by the British government of the hostilities of British subjects against this country, can be urged with advantage or even with safety. In every case we acquiesce with entire cordiality in the course that your reflections determined you to adopt. If, as I am led by your dispatches now before me to conclude, you have not yet thought it time to speak to Earl Russell in the sense indicated in my dispatch No. 493, you may probably think it time to open to him the views submitted in my dispatch No. 545, of this date. Universal expressions by the press and in public assemblies in this country about the transactions occurring in Great Britain, will show you that I have not overestimated evidences of dangers which I have described in that paper; and I think that those expressions can scarcely fail to attract attention in Great Britain. The people of the United States wish to avoid a conflict, above all things an unnecessary conflict, with Great Britain. It is their constitutional habit to avoid war of every kind. They studied and labored long and carefully to avoid the present civil war. It is not wise, however, to conclude from their aversion to war that they will make unreasonable and ruinous sacrifices to avert it, or that when it comes without their fault, and in spite of their best efforts at prevention, they will fail to maintain themselves in the emergency. They soon, in every such exigency, learn the nature and the height of the virtue they are required to practice, and they adopt it. These suggestions are made chiefly for your own consideration, and not with a view that they shall be formally communicated to the British government.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCOIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.,

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 548.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 13, 1863.

SIR: I have laid before the President your dispatch of March 26, (No. 355,) which communicates the debate in the House of Lords on Lord Campbell's question concerning recognition of the insurgents; that of March 27, (No. 356,) which relates a long, free and friendly conversation had between yourself and Earl Russell on the general subject of our relations with Great Britain; that of March 27, (No. 357,) which gives us the two notes which have passed between his lordship and yourself touching the fitting out of certain armed vessels in Glasgow; and that of March 28, (No. 359,) which gives us the debate held in the Commons on the inquiry of Mr. Forster concerning the hostile naval operations of British subjects against the United States.

The pleasing impression made by the first three of these papers is so nearly removed by the latter as to render it difficult for this government to accept as reliable the expectations of a more favorable course on the part of her Majesty's government which you so very reasonably built upon Earl Russell's explanations. Nevertheless, the President has determined to pursue the course of prudence and moderation which you have suggested, until it shall be ascertained whether we may expect any action on the part of her Majesty's government to prevent the hostilities with which we are menaced by British subjects.

The state of the case seems to be this: The United States, laboring under all the difficulties of their situation as a foreign sovereign, unable in a friendly country to put into activity the laws and proclamations of that country which are designed to prevent aggressions by British subjects upon American commerce on the high seas, appeal to her Majesty's government to enforce those laws. On the other hand, her Majesty's government avow their willingness to enforce the same laws, provided they are first furnished with evidence which would probably lead to the conviction of the offenders.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 552.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, April 15, 1863.

SIR: Your attention is called to the inclosed copy of a telegram of yesterday, addressed to this department by the collector of the custom-house at San Francisco, California, relative to conspiracies of insurgents in the neighboring British colony of Vancouver's Island.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Collector Rankin to Mr. Seward.

[Telegram.]

SAN FRANCISCO, April 14, 1863.

Collector at Puget Sound reports plans for fitting out privateers at Victoria. Secessionists very active, and our officers much alarmed. Colonial authorities inform consul that they cannot interfere with the fitting out of privateers. Can anything be done to secure instructions from home government? I am trying to get commanding naval officer to send a steamer to the sound.

IRA P. RANKIN,
Collector.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 386.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, April 23, 1863.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit a copy of a note of Lord Russell, dated yesterday, in answer to mine of the 6th instant, a copy of which accompanied my dispatch No. 369, of the 9th of April. * * *

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Lord Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *April 22, 1863.*

SIR: In acknowledging the receipt of the further letter which you did me the honor to address to me, on the 6th instant, on the subject of the intercepted correspondence, I will merely add that, while entirely assenting to the principles laid down in the authorities to which you refer, I am still unable to perceive their application to any facts which have occurred in this country within the cognizance of her Majesty's government.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 566.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 24, 1863.

SIR: Your dispatch of April 9 (No. 369) has been submitted to the President, together with a copy of a further correspondence which has been held between yourself and Earl Russell concerning the intercepted pretended dispatches of the agents of the insurgents. The ability with which you have defended the rights of the United States in this correspondence is appreciated, and the views you have submitted to his lordship are approved.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Dayton.

[Extract.]

No. 336.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 24, 1863.

SIR: Your dispatch of April 9 (No. 297) has been submitted to the President.

You have rightly interpreted to Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys our views con-

cerning the issue of letters of marque. The unrestrained issue of piratical vessels from Europe to destroy our commerce, break our blockade of insurrectionary ports, and invade our loyal coast, would practically be a European war against the United States, none the less real or dangerous for wanting the sanction of a formal declaration. Congress has committed to the President, as a weapon of national defense, the authority to issue letters of marque. We know that it is a weapon that cannot be handled without great danger of annoyance to the neutral and friendly commercial powers. But even that hazard must be incurred rather than quietly submit to the apprehended greater evil. There are now, as you must have observed, indications that that apprehended greater evil may be averted through the exercise of a restraining power over the enemies of the United States in Great Britain. Hopeful of such a result, we forbear from the issue of letters of marque, and are content to have the weapon ready for use if it shall become absolutely necessary.

It gives me great pleasure to acknowledge that, beyond what we deem the original error of France in recognizing, unnecessarily, as we think, the insurgents as a belligerent, we have every reason to appreciate the just and impartial observance of neutrality which has been practiced in the ports and harbors of France by the government of the Emperor. In any case it will be hereafter, as it has been hertofore, a pleasing duty to conduct all our belligerent proceedings so as to inflict no wrong or injury upon the government or the people of the French empire.

You have also done the country a good service in explaining, in your conversations with Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys, the manner in which we have heretofore maintained our neutrality in foreign wars, by enforcing our enlistment laws, which are in all respects the same as those of Great Britain.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

WILLIAM DAYTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 400.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,

London, May 1, 1863.

SIR: In obedience to so much of the instructions contained in your dispatch No. 545, of the 10th of April, as relates to the loan made here in behalf of the rebels, I have addressed a note to Lord Russell on that subject, a copy of which is herewith transmitted.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Lord Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,

London, April 28, 1863.

MY LORD: I am instructed to inform your lordship that the government of the United States has heard with surprise and regret of the

negotiation of a loan in this city, with conditions of security and payment openly hostile to the United States, and under the strongest presumption that the funds thus supplied are to be used in fitting out expeditions, in violation of her Majesty's proclamation and of the laws of the land, as well as of treaties and the law of nations. The President does not for a moment believe that her Majesty's government have lent or will lend any sanction or approval to these proceedings. The painful fact, nevertheless, is forced upon his attention that this loan contains a direct engagement with the armed insurgents, who have assumed to control, supply, and deliver cotton for the reimbursement of the money advanced, with interest. Hence it becomes an imperative duty to apprise her Majesty's government that this transaction must bring to an end all concessions, of whatever form, that may have been heretofore made for mitigating or alleviating the rigors of the blockade in regard to the shipment of cotton. Neither can any title of any person, whether citizen of the United States or subject of a foreign power, to any cotton or other merchandise, which title is derived from or through any pretended insurgent authority, or other agency hostile to the United States, be respected.

It has always been, and it yet continues to be, the desire of my government to do everything in its power to lighten the difficulties which inevitably follow a state of war to all friendly nations. I am sure that it is with the greatest reluctance it finds itself compelled, by the offensive acts of apparently irresponsible parties, bent upon carrying on hostilities under the shelter of neutrality, to restrict rather than to expand the avenues of legitimate trade. The responsibility for this must rest mainly upon those who, for motives best known to themselves, have labored and continue to labor so strenuously and effectually to furnish the means for the protraction of the struggle.

Renewing, &c.,

CHARLES FRANCOIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 409.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, May 8, 1863.

SIR: Lord Russell has acknowledged the reception of the notice contained in my letter of the 28th ultimo, of which the particulars were given in my dispatch No. 400, of the 1st instant; in a note a copy of which is herewith transmitted.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Lord Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *May 1, 1863.*

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 28th ultimo, acquainting me that in consequence of the negotiation

in London of a loan, with conditions of security and payment openly hostile to the United States, and under the strongest presumption that the funds thus supplied are to be used in fitting out expeditions in violation of her Majesty's proclamation and of the laws of the land, as well as of treaties and of the law of nations, the President of the United States puts an end to all concessions, of whatever form that may have heretofore been made, for mitigating or alleviating the rigors of the blockade in regard to the shipment of cotton; and, further, that the title of any person, whether citizen of the United States or subject of a foreign power, to any cotton or other merchandise, which title is derived from or through any pretended insurgent authority or other agency hostile to the United States, cannot be respected.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 588.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 9, 1863.

SIR: Your dispatch of April 23 (No. 385) has been received. This government will not fail to do ample justice to the good disposition which her Majesty's government is manifesting to repress the equipment of hostile vessels from British ports.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 590.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 9, 1863.

SIR: Your dispatch of the 23d ultimo (No. 386) has been received, together with the copy of Earl Russell's note to you of the 22d of the same month, relative to the intercepted insurgent correspondence.

I have no reason to question your decision not to prolong the special correspondence which you have held with his lordship upon that subject.

I am your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 13, 1863, p. 1.]

Return to an address of the honorable the House of Commons, dated July 8, 1863, for "copy of a memorial from certain ship-owners of Liverpool to the secretary of state for foreign affairs, suggesting an alteration in the foreign enlistment act."

No. 1.

MEMORIAL.

To the Right Honorable the Earl Russell, her Majesty's principal secretary of state for the foreign department:

The memorial of the undersigned, ship-owners of Liverpool, sheweth, that your memorialists, who are deeply interested in British shipping, view with dismay the probable future consequences of a state of affairs which permits a foreign belligerent to construct in and send to sea from British ports vessels of war, in contravention of the provisions of the existing law.

That the immediate effect of placing at the disposal of that foreign belligerent a very small number of steam-cruisers has been to paralyze the mercantile marine of a powerful maritime and naval nation, inflicting within a few months losses, direct and indirect, on its ship-owning and mercantile interests which years of peace may prove inadequate to retrieve.

That your memorialists cannot shut their eyes to the probability that in any future war between England and a foreign power, however insignificant in naval strength, the example now set by subjects of her Majesty while England is neutral may be followed by citizens of other countries, neutral when England is belligerent; and that the attitude of helplessness in which her Majesty's government have declared their inability to detect and punish breaches of the law notoriously committed by certain of her Majesty's subjects may hereafter be successfully imitated by the governments of those other countries in answer to English remonstrances.

That the experience of late events has proved to the conviction of your memorialists that the possession by a belligerent of swift steam-cruisers, under no necessity, actual or conventional, to visit the possibly blockaded home ports of that belligerent, but able to obtain all requisite supplies from neutrals, will become a weapon of offense against which no preponderance of naval strength can effectually guard, and the severity of which will be felt in the ratio of the shipping and mercantile wealth of the nation against whose mercantile marine the efforts of those steam-cruisers may be directed.

That the effect of future war with any power thus enabled to purchase, prepare, and refit vessels of war in neutral ports will inevitably be to transfer to neutral flags that portion of the sea-carrying trade of the world which is now enjoyed by your memorialists and by other British ship-owners.

That, over and above the chances of pecuniary loss to themselves, your memorialists share in the regret with which a law-regarding community must naturally look on successful attempts to evade the provisions of an act of Parliament passed for a single and simple purpose, but which has been found not to give the executive all the powers needed for its effective execution.

That your memorialists would accordingly respectfully urge upon your

lordship the expediency of proposing to Parliament to sanction the introduction of such amendments into the foreign enlistment act as may have the effect of giving greater power to the executive to prevent the construction in British ports of ships destined for the use of belligerents.

And your memorialists would further suggest to your lordship the importance of endeavoring to secure the assent of the governments of the United States of America and of other foreign countries to the adoption of similar regulations in those countries also.

All which your memorialists respectfully submit.

Lamport & Holt.
James Baines & Co.
Richard Nicholson & Son.
W. B. Boadle.
J. Prowse & Co.
Currie, Newton & Co.
Nelson, Alexander & Co.
Kendall Brown.
G. S. H. Fletcher & Co.
J. Aikin.
Finlay, Campbell & Co.
Cropper, Ferguson & Co.
J. Campbell.
S. R. Graves.
Rankin, Gilmour & Co.

James Brown & Co.
James Poole & Co.
W. Jacob & Co.
Henry Moore & Co.
Imrie & Tomlinson.
Thomas Chilton.
Jones, Palmer & Co.
Farnworth & Jardine.
Thomas & James Harrison.
L. H. Macintyre.
Potter Brothers.
Chas. Geo. Cowie & Co.
W. J. Seally.
R. Girvin & Co.
O. T. Bowring & Co.

Rathbone, Bros. & Co.

LIVERPOOL, *June 9, 1863.*

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 13, 1863, p. 2.]

No. 2.

Mr. Hammond to Messrs. Lamport & Holt and others.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *July 6, 1863.*

GENTLEMEN: I am directed by Earl Russell to acknowledge the receipt of the memorial dated the 9th of June, signed by you and others of the merchants at Liverpool, in which you urge upon his lordship the expediency of proposing to Parliament such amendments to the foreign enlistment act as shall enable the government to prevent the construction in British ports of ships destined for the use of belligerents.

I am to state to you in reply, that in Lord Russell's opinion the foreign enlistment act is effectual for all reasonable purposes, and to the full extent to which international law or comity can require, provided proof can be obtained of any act done with the intent to violate it.

Even if the provisions of the act were extended, it would still be necessary that such proof should be obtained, because no law could or should be passed to punish upon suspicion instead of upon proof.

I am, &c.,

E. HAMMOND.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 663.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 24, 1863.

SIR: I have received and have communicated to the Secretary of the Navy your dispatch of the 10th of July, No. 449. You may rely, I think,

upon everything being done that can be done to resist the formidable naval attack which is being prepared for us on the British shores. It may be hoped, in view of some changes which have recently occurred in our military situation, that the British government will not be indifferent to transactions occurring there which tends so strongly towards alienation and war.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 480.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, August 21, 1863.

SIR: On the reception of your No. 645, of the 7th of July, I addressed a note of thanks to Earl Russell for the regulation against repacking gunpowder at Belize, British Honduras, recently put in force there by Governor Seymour, of that colony.

I now have the honor to inclose copies of my letter, and of his lordship's reply.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Lord Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, August 1, 1863.

MY LORD: From information received by the government which I have the honor to represent, the fact has come to its knowledge that his excellency Governor Seymour, of Belize, in British Honduras, has given notice to the merchants of that place of his intention to enforce the law against repacking gunpowder there, and limiting the quantity of that article which persons may keep in store. This proceeding is likely to have the effect to check a contraband trade with the insurgents in the United States, by which they have heretofore received supplies of that article, and to that extent is considered as indicative of a disposition to abstain from participation in the struggle now going on.

I am directed to make this fair and impartial conduct of his excellency the subject of special acknowledgments to her Majesty's government.

I pray your lordship's acceptance, &c.,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *August 10, 1863.*

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 1st instant, conveying the thanks of the United States government for

certain regulations issued by Governor Seymour with regard to gun-powder at Belize.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCOIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 689.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, September 2, 1863.

SIR: Edwin G. Eastman, esq., the United States consul at Queens-town, Cork, in a dispatch of the 14th ultimo, has informed me of the friendly spirit evinced by Rear-Admiral Sir Lewis T. Jones, K. O. B., commander-in-chief of her Majesty's naval forces at Queenstown, towards this government, in his efforts to prevent the embarkation of a rebel crew and some officers on board a vessel off the port of Queenstown, supposed to have been the Southerner. I will thank you to convey to her Majesty's government, and to the rear-admiral, a suitable expression of the acknowledgments of the President for so signal a service.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCOIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 691.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, September 2, 1863.

SIR: While the views of the probable cause of events in England which are presented in your dispatch of the 7th of August, No. 400, are deemed very reasonable and are therefore very gratifying, it is at the same time necessary to keep in mind the fact that we have nothing in the nature of guarantee against the incursion of her armed vessels, so long threatened, and now understood to be well prepared in British waters.

It is also to be considered that the new phase of affairs in Mexico creates much solicitude; nor must we overlook the strange attitude which the Spanish government has assumed in regard to the claim of extended maritime jurisdiction in Cuba. In consideration of these facts, this government is pressing its preparations for naval defense with all possible energy. This country, being left to infer what it may from the tone of the European organs, does infer that all the maritime powers of Europe have become our enemies. No wonder, therefore, that it is rapidly rising towards the temper which might induce a defiance of them. I have studied the complications of Europe as carefully as possible, and I am more than ever unable to comprehend how it can now be the interest of Great Britain any more than it is of the United States that the two nations should be left to drift on in the way they are drifting, towards absolute alienation. On the contrary, I see in such a course only unnecessary dangers to the United States, while, if I do not misjudge, the prestige of Great Britain herself is waning under the influences of our

altercations, very much as if the two nations were one country divided and distracted by civil war. Nevertheless, I have looked in vain for evidences on the part of the British government that it had adopted any such views. I have conversed freely with Lord Lyons on this subject, and while I cannot assume to speak of any impressions that he may entertain, I am satisfied that he would cheerfully do all that he may be authorized to do to meliorate the painful condition of affairs which I have described. In all our foreign relations, the President desires nothing more earnestly than that those which we maintain towards England may be amicable and ever cordial. No wise President can wish differently. I shall be pleased to know whether you discern any evidences of such a disposition in the governing circles of Great Britain.

It is hardly necessary to say that these suggestions do not proceed from any change that has occurred here, or is foreseen, calculated to shake our confidence in the success of the cause of the Union, either in the field or in popular elections. That confidence has never known the least degree of variation or abatement. We act uniformly on the principle that this nation stands on its broad foundations as safely as any existing State in Europe. You see much debate in the newspapers concerning terms and conditions of peace, and in these debates very earnest discussion of the policy to be pursued in regard to slavery. The parties in these debates affect a knowledge of the special views of the President and of members of his administration. It is, perhaps, proper that you should know that the executive government, instead of being occupied with these discussions, regards them as premature, and is mainly engaged in the duty of averting foreign war and suppressing the insurrection by military and naval preparations and operations.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 499.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, September 17, 1863.

SIR: I transmit the copy of a note from Lord Russell, dated the 11th instant, in reply to mine of the 1st of August, already forwarded with my dispatch No. 480, both in relation to the subject to which my attention was called by your No. 645, of the 7th of July.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *September 11, 1863.*

SIR: Your letter of the 1st ultimo, conveying the thanks of the United States government for certain regulations, in regard to gunpowder, issued by the lieutenant-governor of British Honduras, was forwarded in due course to the secretary of state for the colonies, and I have now the

honor to inform you that I have received from his grace, in reply, a letter stating that it will, no doubt, be satisfactory to Governor Seymour to learn that any measures of his have a tendency to promote friendly relations with foreign governments.

The Duke of Newcastle, however, observes that as Governor Seymour's measures respecting the export and repacking of gunpowder, and the limitation of the quantity to be kept in store, may be attributed to a policy other than neutral, and which it would not be possible to enforce consistently, his grace thinks it right to state that he has not received from Governor Seymour any report of the adoption of measures to prevent the export of gunpowder to the so-styled Confederate States, though he is aware that it occasionally becomes necessary to take strong measures for preventing supplies of gunpowder being obtained by Indian tribes in the neighborhood of the colony, whose peaceable demeanor cannot always be relied upon.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCOIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 740.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, October 24, 1863.

SIR: I have received your dispatch of the 1st of October, (No. 504.)

The very able speech made by Earl Russell at Blairgowrie is, in its more important aspects, so just and liberal towards the United States that it cannot fail to modify the sentiments of asperity hitherto prevailing among the people in both countries.

Every day's experience of new difficulties in the conduct of the relations of the two countries upon principles which render possible the dispatch of armed naval expeditions from British ports to make war on the commerce of the United States could not fail to increase anxiety here, and irritation in both countries. It is not forgotten by this government that one war between the United States and Great Britain has already arisen out of controversies about neutral rights, not more serious than those with which we are now so constantly engaged. The United States, at all times sincerely deprecating a recurrence of that form of national calamity, must necessarily deprecate it now more earnestly than they have done heretofore, for the obvious reason that it would coincide with and aggravate a painful civil conflict. We have never doubted that the government of Great Britain are as sincerely opposed to an unnecessary disturbance of our mutual peace as we ourselves are, and, therefore, we have been anxious that her Majesty's ministers should understand, as clearly as we do, the dangers towards which, as it has seemed to us, we were drifting. It would be no more congenial with the disposition of the President to use those apprehensions by way of menace or intimidation to Great Britain than it would be consistent with the generous spirit of Great Britain to be approached in that manner. In the absence of specifications, I have not been able to find in your correspondence with Earl Russell anything which, dispassionately interpreted, could justly expose you to censure in this respect. If, however, anything of the kind should be indicated to you, or should occur either on your part or on mine, the President will expect that such explanations shall be made as her

Majesty's government, with a just regard to the sensibilities of the British nation, may require.

The transactions in which we are engaged are too great, and our responsibilities concerning them are too grave, to allow us for a moment the indulgence of individual irritation, or even of the national jealousy which is quick in seeking or in giving occasions of offense. Great Britain has this one advantage over us in all these cases, that the difficulties between the two countries result directly from a domestic feud of our own, in which unnatural and disloyal Americans are, with infinite art and labor, seeking to involve foreign and friendly nations.

I am, sir, your most obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extracts.]

No. 756.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 9, 1863.

SIR: * * * * * * *

We shall persevere in the course we have hitherto pursued of cultivating the friendship we so consistently cherish, unless we shall be obliged to change it by one of two events, neither of which we expect to happen; namely, first, that new hostile naval expeditions come out from British ports to make war upon us on the high seas or in our ports; second, that Great Britain shall cease to recognize the sovereignty of the United States as it is now recognized. If neither of these events shall happen, we shall not only be content to leave to such British statesmen as choose to exercise it the indulgence of hostile declamation against our country, but we shall try, as we are now doing, to counteract here the resulting effects of such illiberal demonstrations. It would be a common misfortune, however, of the two countries, if this policy should be misunderstood in England, so as to induce a belief that the United States are disposed now to submit to what they have heretofore declared would be intolerable injuries on the part of any foreign power.

* * * * * * *

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 761.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
Washington, November 16, 1863.

SIR: I inclose a copy of executive document No. 103, first session 33d Congress, which contains the correspondence between Mr. Marcy and the ministers of Great Britain and France here, at the opening of the Crimean war. Your attention is particularly invited to that part of

the correspondence which relates to the expectations of those governments in regard to the equipment of privateers in this country.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

Hon. CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[For inclosure, see General Appendix, No. 5.]

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 586.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, January 28, 1864.

SIR:

I transmit a copy of his lordship's note of the 23d instant, acknowledging mine of the 20th, transmitted with my No. 580, of the 21st instant.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *January 23, 1864.*

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 20th instant, inclosing copies of papers purporting to naturalize as citizens of the so-called Confederate States two British subjects serving on board the confederate steamer Georgia, and I have the honor to acquaint you that copies of these papers have been transmitted to the proper department of her Majesty's government.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 608.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, March 3, 1864.

SIR: Under the directions contained in your No. 834, of the 6th of February, I addressed a note to Lord Russell on the subject of the steamer Will-o'-the-Wisp. Copies of that and of his lordship's reply are herewith transmitted.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

*Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.*LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, February 22, 1864.

MY LORD: I am directed by my government to represent to your lordship that it has been advised of the early departure from the port of Halifax of the British steamer *Will-o'-the-Wisp*, in ballast, for the island of Bermuda, on account of the insurgents of the United States, and under the direction of their agents now having harbor at Halifax; furthermore, that, on arriving at Bermuda, this steamer will take in ordnance and stores for the use of the insurgents, and attempt to make her way into Wilmington, all under the direction of emissaries of the insurgents at Bermuda.

It is deeply to be regretted that the efforts pertinaciously made to procrastinate this struggle in America should appear to be exclusively undertaken from the kingdom of her Majesty and its various dependencies. There is evidently an impression widely spread in the latter that all evasions of neutrality not positively flagrant may escape reprehension. I am requested, very respectfully, to suggest to your lordship that the colonial authorities at Bermuda may be apprised of this hostile proceeding, in order that, if deemed advisable, it may be arrested.

I pray your lordship to accept the assurances of the highest consideration with which I have the honor to be, my lord, your most obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 802.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 6, 1864.

SIR: Your dispatch of the 11th of December (No. 554) has been received, and your proceedings therein related concerning the pirate *Rappahannock* are approved.

I acknowledge also the receipt of your dispatch of the 11th of December, (No. 555,) which is accompanied by a copy of the correspondence which has taken place between yourself and Earl Russell on the subject of the enlistment of pirates and equipment of ships of war by British subjects, and their naval operations on the high seas against the unarmed merchantmen of the United States. The papers which you have thus submitted to his lordship prove beyond a possible doubt that a systematic naval war has been carried on for more than a year by subjects of her Majesty, from the British islands as a base, and there is every reason for believing that unremitted efforts are made to give that warfare increased vigor and extension. It now appears from these papers that the belligerents have a regularly constituted treasury and counting-houses, with agents in London for paying the wages of the British subjects who are enlisted there in this nefarious service. Hitherto, remonstrances made by the United States to her Majesty's government have been held inconclusive and unsatisfactory, because it was said that they were not attended with such clear, direct, and conclusive proofs of the offenses complained of as would enable the government to arrest the offenders and apply judicial correction to the practices indi-

cated. It seems to the President that this difficulty has now been fully and completely removed. Having recently brought to the knowledge of her Majesty's government flagrant violations of our national rights of a similar kind attempted in her Majesty's North American provinces, and having still more recently given to Earl Russell, through your hands, the avowal of all these transactions by domestic conspirators against the United States, it only remains for me to inform you that the President awaits with deep concern a determination by her Majesty's government of the grave question which you have been instructed to submit to them, namely, whether that government will adopt any new measures to put an end to practices which are not less intolerable to the United States than they are inconsistent with the neutrality which her Majesty has proclaimed and enjoined upon all of her subjects. In writing so earnestly upon this subject, I do not by any means forget that recently her Majesty's government have taken measures to detain certain vessels which were being built for the purpose of carrying on war with the United States, nor do I overlook the fact that her Majesty's government have promised due attention to a special complaint which is referred to in this communication. The President does not, in the least, doubt that her Majesty's government are earnestly and seriously engaged in considering several of such complaints, distinctly and separately. Nevertheless, I trust that I shall not be thought unreasonably importunate in asking you again to press the general subject upon the attention of her Majesty's government, in the light of the facts now first brought to the knowledge of this department. Alarming events are occurring on our borders; prosecutions are pending in Great Britain. We have been obliged to institute a special naval and military police in the port of New York, which must soon prove as annoying to lawful traders from friendly states as to our own citizens, and thus new irritations are arising, and new controversies are gathering up between the two countries.

On our part, we trace all the evils to an unnecessary, and, as we think, an anomalous recognition by her Majesty's government of insurgents as a naval power who have no pretensions to that title. We desire to know whether, after all its gross abuses and injurious consequences, that concession must remain unrevoked and unmodified? If it must remain, then we desire to know whether her Majesty's government can apply a cure to these abuses and consequences, or whether we are expected to devise and provide the proper remedies? If the British government is to do nothing, and the United States everything, I know not what security commerce can ever have hereafter against universal practices of privateering and piracy, except that even the lawful trade between friendly countries must be carried on under the protection of ever present and adequate armed force.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 917.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 22, 1864.

SIR: I have received your confidential dispatch of the 8th of April, No. 651, together with a copy of the London Times, which contains the reason assigned by the law lords for their decision dismissing the appeal

of the Alexandria. I have expressed, in a letter to Mr. Evarts, the view I have taken of the course to be pursued on that subject in London, and I have transmitted to you a copy of that communication.

I have submitted to the President the reflections upon the temper and disposition of the British nation as they are affected by our civil war, with which you have favored me. The correctness of your views is established by the fact that the insurgents manifestly have a bold, vigorous, and effective party in both houses of Parliament and in the British press, which party is confessedly influential in the general administration of public affairs, while the United States seem to have in the British legislature and in the British press no advocates or defenders, except persons who, however great their ability and worth, are, nevertheless, practically excluded from the conduct of national affairs. There is, moreover, a marked habit prevailing in Great Britain of comparing British resources and achievements with American resources and achievements, and this is done so unnecessarily, and often in a spirit so illiberal, as to indicate a spirit of rivalry. Our civil war has endured three years. It has necessarily brought up many irritating and perplexing questions between the two countries. I think it would be safe to say that no belligerent state ever bore itself more forbearingly towards a neutral power whose subjects committed so many injuries and provocations than we have done towards Great Britain. I think it equally clear that no neutral power was ever more unyielding and more exacting towards a belligerent than Great Britain has been towards the United States. Your inference from this condition of things is that this government must apply itself with the greatest possible energy to bring the civil war to a speedy and triumphant conclusion, or else it may have reason to expect conflict with Great Britain and with her allies. While, however, we accept this wise counsel, it would be unjust on my part toward the Treasury, War, and Navy Departments, were I to withhold the expression of a thorough and deliberate conviction that the war is conducted with all the energy and skill which any administration of the government of the United States in their circumstances could command.

The conflict is indeed a great one, and the ideas and interests which sustain the parties engaged in it render it fierce and obstinate. We must, therefore, accept the case as it is—a case of severe domestic trial, with continual danger of foreign intervention. We have before us but one line of duty—that is, the way of perseverance. It is the course we have pursued hitherto. It will save us now, unless we are to be lost. That this nation can be lost is a conclusion that neither our virtue nor our patriotism nor even our reason can accept.

I will not say how great our confidence in the opening campaign is. Events are so near that we can more wisely wait for them than anticipate them. Nor can we prudently forget that of all human transactions those of war are, in their sequence, the most uncertain and capricious, although the ultimate results are a subject of political calculation. We have the conviction that the national cause is in a far stronger condition now than it has been at any previous stage of the civil war, while the disunion forces seem weaker than at any time heretofore. The maritime powers whose interference is to be apprehended if we shall be unfortunate, seem to me to be somewhat less at liberty to engage against us now than they have hitherto been. I think it certain that we have more friends and fewer enemies abroad now than we have had at former periods of the war. Thus time seems to be favoring us, and time is always the best friend of justice and truth. Nor is it necessary to sup-

press the conviction; that pacific as the temper of the American people is, yet that the efforts and sacrifices which they have hitherto made are inconsiderable compared with what they would make if now assailed by a foreign enemy. Practically, there is no longer a hearing in the country for a man who counsels fear of the enemy at home; much less would there be a hearing for one who should counsel submission to aggression from abroad. These are the grounds upon which the President builds his hope that we shall pass safely through the trials which are before us.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 919.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, April 23, 1864.

SIR: I have to acknowledge the receipt of your dispatch of April 8, No. 646, with its complement, namely, a copy of articles of association for the organization of a joint stock company, whose object is to carry supplies from British ports to the insurgents, under a contract with the insurgent cabal at Richmond. The project appears quite portentous on paper, and doubtlessly it is sufficient to require preparations to defeat it by our naval forces. These forces are now being vigorously augmented. The movements of our military and naval forces are likely to cause some new embarrassments to their schemes, which these shameless confederates do not now appear to have anticipated. I am desirous not to multiply unnecessary complaints to her Majesty's government. Those which have already been presented are sufficient to render the relation between Great Britain and the United States uncomfortable. Nevertheless, I do not think this new combination ought to be allowed to go into activity without special remonstrance. It is flagrantly incompatible with the neutrality which her Majesty's government have proclaimed, and is directly subversive of peace and amity between the two countries. It obliges the United States, for purposes of self-defense, to impose restrictions upon trade with Great Britain and with her colonies. It sets a precedent for maritime nations which must be of evil effect. In this respect its consequences are incalculable if Europe is destined to become involved in any general war.

Submitting to your discretion all questions of time, of form, and of language, the President expects you to remonstrate with her Majesty's government upon the subject.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 684.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,

London, May 12, 1864.

SIR: In consequence of a representation made by Mr. Bravay, the ostensible claimant of the iron-clad rams, that he is now too busy in

obtaining another election to the French Chambers to attend to this matter, the trial fixed for the 27th instant has been postponed to the 6th of June.

I received notice this morning by telegram from Mr. Fox, the consul at Plymouth, that some of the crew of the ship *Avon*, which was destroyed by the *Florida* on the 30th of March, have been landed there. The morning newspapers report the *Florida* to have arrived at St. Nazaire, in France.

There appears to be some attempt going on here to concentrate whatever naval force may be gathered by the rebels, for objects which I do not quite penetrate. Officers are reported to me as continually coming over in the steamers, whilst I learn that efforts are steadily continued at Liverpool and here to add to the inducements to seamen to enlist. It is possible that the rebel agents count upon getting one or more of the four steamers which are in process of construction for them in France; and perhaps upon the release of the *Rappahannock*, though that event seems less likely of the two.

* * * * *

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 1018.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, July 2, 1864.

SIR: Your dispatch of the 10th of June, No. 721, has been received. It is accompanied by a complaint from Earl Russell, that certain United States vessels had violated the neutrality regulations of the British government in the Bahama islands. I shall at once request the Secretary of the Navy to investigate these complaints. In the mean time you can hardly omit to inform Earl Russell that the whole of the British West India islands are practically used by our insurgent enemies as a base for hostile operations against the United States, and the profits derived by British subjects from these enterprises are avowed in every part of the British empire with as much freedom and as much satisfaction as if the operations were in conformity with international law and with treaties.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 854.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,

London, January 12, 1865.

SIR: I have to acknowledge the reception of dispatches from the department, numbered 1105 and from 1107 to 1211 inclusive.

* * * * *

I have the honor to transmit a copy of the London Times of the 11th instant, containing a long communication from the writer who signs himself *Historicus*. Thus far the British policy has had the practical effect of giving to the insurgents the privileges without entailing upon them much of the responsibilities of a belligerent. This has tempted them to encroach somewhat beyond the power of endurance. It is a little unlucky for this government that it is driven by the rebels to manifest resentment just at the moment of the most marked decline of their power. For this reason I doubt whether much earnestness can be expected in its action. It is, nevertheless, something of a symptom that the Times is willing to open its columns to so unequivocal a condemnation of their proceedings. Whatever may be the effect of it on the government, it will be useful in checking the tendencies of a large class of readers of that newspaper, as well as of the provincial presses which habitually follow its lead. The chances now are that under the late blows the aristocratic sympathy with the rebels as a *righteous* cause may shrink into rather small dimensions. That which commenced in an attempt to perpetrate upon the intelligence of Europe a fraud of the most flagrant character will scarcely fail in the long run to betray its true nature through acts that defy all excuse.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

[For inclosure see General Appendix, No. 3.]

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 1256.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 30, 1865.

SIR: I have to acknowledge the receipt of your dispatch of the 12th of January.

I have read with much interest the letter of "*Historicus*," in the Times, to which you have directed my attention. The publication clears up a mystery which I had found insoluble, and which for that reason was giving me some uneasiness.

I give you herewith a copy of two pretended dispatches of John Slidell, at Paris, to Judah P. Benjamin, in Richmond, which were written on the 28th of November and on the 13th of December, respectively. In the first the emissary writes to the conspirator that, in consequence of the absence of Lord Cowley, M. Drouyn de Lhuys has had no opportunity to speak to him on the subject of a certain communication of Benjamin, described as No. 42. Slidell adds, however, that as Lord Cowley has now returned to Paris, and as both he and M. Drouyn de Lhuys are invited guests of the Emperor at Compiègne during this week, Slidell thinks that the subject will be broached there. At least, (so he says,) "such is the opinion of my friend at the Affaires Étrangères." Slidell, continuing the subject, says to Benjamin: "Mr. Hotze will have informed you that, after diligent inquiry, he cannot find that any instructions relating to our crusiers or their prizes have recently issued from the admiralty. When the minister of foreign affairs returns to Paris, I will, I doubt not, be able to ascertain whether anything has been said or done by him in the matter."

Renewing the subject in the paper of the 13th of December, Slidell informs Benjamin that, for some reason or other, Lord Cowley did not avail himself of his invitation to Compiègne, (before mentioned,) and only returned from London a few days since. But Slidell adds, that during Lord Cowley's absence, M. Drouyn de Lhuys had not neglected to call the attention of the British government, as he had before promised, to the subject of Benjamin's dispatch, described as No. 43, as will appear by the following extract from a letter which Slidell had received from his friend at the Foreign Office. The extract is in the following words:

"M. Drouyn de Lhuys has written to our ambassador in London about the proposal of your government relative to neutral goods on board enemies' vessels, and wishes to know the opinion of the English cabinet on that subject. He also, in conversation with the ministers of the marine and commerce, expressed the opinion that the proposal would be very acceptable. He is waiting for an answer, which I will not fail to ask him to communicate to me."

Slidell closes up the subject with the remark, that he expects soon to learn the result of this overture to the British government.

The mystery which I have mentioned arose out of our ignorance of the contents of Benjamin's so-called dispatch No. 43, which was the basis of an intrigue intended to be carried on by an emissary at Paris, through the agency of a spy in the French Foreign Office, with the expected, but withheld, co-operation of the British ambassador at the imperial court. I now learn the character of that proposition from the publication of "Historicus," in the Times. Benjamin, with gentle coercion, proposes to France and England modifications of their practice in regard to captures by rebel cruisers, as follows:

First, in the case of a vessel under enemy's flag, with cargo wholly or in part belonging to neutrals, Mr. Benjamin says that, under ordinary circumstances, this case would present no embarrassments. The captured vessel would be taken into a port of the captors, or of a neutral country, the portion of the cargo belonging to the neutral would be delivered to the owners, and the vessel, with such portion of the cargo as belongs to the enemy, would be condemned as prize. Benjamin then proceeds thus: "The action of neutral governments has placed serious obstacles in the way of doing justice to their own people. They have closed their ports to the admission of captured vessels, and have thus rendered it impossible to make delivery in their own ports of the property of their own subjects, found on board of vessels of our enemies, while it would be exposing those vessels to almost certain recapture to attempt to bring them into our ports, for the captured vessels are almost invariably sailing vessels, and the enemy's cruisers off our ports are steamers." Mr. Benjamin, after thus presenting the case, concludes upon it as follows: If, for instance, Great Britain will not permit a captured enemy's vessel to be carried into one of her ports for the purpose of their delivery to a British subject of his goods found on board, she would certainly have no just ground of complaint that the goods were not restored to their owner. If, therefore, on the renewed representations we are about to make, we find neutral nations persist in refusing to receive the property of their subjects in their own ports, when captured by us on enemy's vessels, it will become necessary to instruct our cruisers to destroy such property whenever they are unable to bring the prize into our ports. Benjamin, by way of stimulating her Majesty's government to prompt compliance with these insurgent demands, complacently assumes that the commanders of our national cruisers should

be instructed to continue their former practice of allowing the enemy to ransom his vessel in cases where the neutral property on board is of large value, or bears any considerable proportion to that of the enemy. But if a ransom bond is refused, or if the proportion of neutral property is small compared with the value of the vessel and the hostile cargo, the whole should be destroyed whenever the prize cannot be brought into a port of our own or a neutral country.

Having thus, in this manner, disposed of the first assumed case, he proceeds to state a second one, namely: a vessel really neutral, with cargo wholly or in part belonging to the enemy. Benjamin then states the rebel practice upon the case thus assumed, as follows: "The cruisers of the confederacy will therefore allow vessels of neutrals to pass free, unless laden with goods contraband of war; the contraband goods, if not the property of the owner of the vessel, are to be taken out if practicable, and transhipped or destroyed, and she is to be allowed to continue her voyage. But if the owner of the vessel has put on board contraband goods belonging to himself, destined for the enemy's country, he thereby forfeits the neutral character, and the ship is to be considered an enemy's vessel, and to be dealt with as such. No conflict with neutral powers on this subject is apprehended, as they have with entire unanimity issued proclamations forbidding their vessels, during the present war, from engaging in contraband trade, under penalty of forfeiture of national protection."

Benjamin then draws under review a third case, namely: a vessel ostensibly neutral, but really hostile, fraudulently placed under a neutral flag, and furnished with fraudulent papers, to protect her from capture.

In regard to this case, Benjamin avows this to be the practice of the rebels: "The captain (of the cruiser) should in any case make rigid examination of the papers and documents of every vessel sailing under a neutral flag, known to have belonged to the enemy at the commencement of the war. He should take into consideration the nature of the trade in which the vessel is engaged, the national character of the master, the papers found on board, the place at which the alleged sale to the neutral took effect, by delivery of the vessel, and every other circumstance tending to establish the true nature of the transfer, and to satisfy his mind whether the vessel be really neutral, or merely disguised as such. If the captured vessel has double sets of papers, or if papers have been destroyed or subducted by her master during the chase, or if she has continued in the same course of trade and under the same master since the alleged sale to the neutral, it may be safely concluded that the property is still hostile, and covered by fraudulent use of neutral flag. In these and all other cases where there is great and decided preponderance of evidence to show that the vessel is really enemy's property, the cruiser must act on his conviction, and treat her as such, leaving to his government the responsibility of satisfying any neutral claim for her value. But when the commander has serious doubts as to the true character of the transfer, it will be proper rather to dismiss the vessel, if she cannot be brought into port, than to exercise a harsh and doubtful right."

These are the new positions assumed by the rebels of the United States, recognized as a belligerent by the principal maritime powers of Europe, in derogation of the sovereignty of the United States. The positions dispense in every case with the necessity of ports and courts, and substitute the deck of the captor for the one, and the will of the captain for the other. The United States have no direct interest in the question

whether the other maritime powers shall acquiesce in the rebel claim thus made, because they are now at open war with the claimants. But they are indirectly interested, because it is presumed that the maritime powers will not expect the United States as a belligerent to concede to those powers any rights, privileges, or advantages, which those powers may consent to waive in favor of the other so-called belligerent. You will, therefore, apply to Earl Russell for information.

Not having been made acquainted by the two maritime powers with the grave questions which have been submitted to them by the conspiracy at Richmond, it would not become us to intervene in the discussion of them. Otherwise, it might not be altogether improper for us to suggest, as a simple and effective mode of meeting these questions, that Great Britain should concede no belligerent privilege to any cruiser that is exclusively manned, equipped, and dispatched from British ports, in violation of British laws and of the law of nations. The insurgents do not even pretend to have any cruisers, except those which were so manned, equipped, and dispatched. I think that we may not unreasonably hope for such a decision on the part of the British government as well as the French government. Certainly it would be a very peculiar result of the British policy in regard to this war, if, while lawful British commerce is respected by the United States, it should be embarrassed or destroyed by vessels issuing from her own ports in aid of the insurgents. But this is a matter which may wisely be left to the exclusive consideration of the British government.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

(Same to Mr. Bigelow, No. 28, *mutatis mutandis*.)

Mr. Slidell to Mr. Benjamin.

No. 75.]

PARIS, November 28, 1864.

SIR: As I am still without the dispatch referred to in your No. 42, I fear that it has miscarried, and beg leave to suggest the transmission of a duplicate. I have to thank you for the copies of the State map of Virginia; one of them I have presented to our excellent friend the Duke de Persigny. I have been prevented from placing a second in the hands of the Emperor by the serious illness of Mr. Marquand, who, I trust, will soon be able to resume his functions.

In conformity with the intention of which I had the honor to advise you in my last dispatch of 15th instant, the joint notes to the different European powers have all been forwarded though the several legations at this court, with the exception of that to Russia; as I had reason to suppose that some objection might be made in that case, I have sent the documents by mail to St. Petersburg, directed to the minister of foreign affairs.

The note for Rome was sent by Mr. James T. Soutter, of Virginia, to Bishop Lynch, with a request that, should the latter be absent, he, Mr. S., should hand it in person to Cardinal Antonelli. The accompanying copy of a letter from Mr. S. will inform you of the very gratifying manner in which it was received by his eminence.

The President's message has just reached us; its frank and manly tone commands universal admiration; copious extracts from it have

been published in nearly all the Paris journals, and are producing a very marked and salutary effect on public opinion. It appears at a very favorable moment, as the Italian question has ceased to occupy the press, which it had almost monopolized for the past two or three months; for this reason, and the absence of any apparent cause to apprehend European difficulties, our affairs have to a certain extent taken its place, and I believe that an impulse in that direction has been given to the semi-official journals from high quarters.

In consequence of the absence of Lord Cowley, Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys has had no opportunity to speak to him on the subject of your No. 42, but so he has returned, and they are both guests of the Emperor at Compiègne during this week. I think that the subject will be broached there; at least such is the opinion of my friend at the *Affaires Étrangères*. Mr. Hotze will have informed you that, after diligent inquiry, he cannot find that any instructions relating to our cruisers or their prizes have recently issued from the admiralty. When the minister of foreign affairs returns to Paris I will, I doubt not, be able to ascertain whether anything has been said or done by him in the matter.

Since my No. 71, of 13th September, but £9,500 of the seven per cent. cotton loan has been converted. The last certificate issued bears date 19th October, and as a considerable amount of these certificates is said to be in the market, it is to be presumed that no further conversions will be made for some time to come. This check of the process of absorption of the bonds which was going on so healthily can only be attributed to the cessation of the facilities heretofore afforded for the delivery of cotton to the holders of certificates. I take it for granted that this cessation has been caused by stringent military exigencies, and hope that it may not be of long duration. In the mean while it has seriously affected the price of the bonds, which, in view of our late military successes, would otherwise have shown a considerable advance. The agent of the Albion Trading Company especially complains that the ships of the company dispatched under the contract made with Mr. McRae and me have been compelled to load one-half of their cargoes on government account; as this contract, when made, was considered highly advantageous to our interests, it would seriously affect the credit of the confederacy if any change in our policy in regard to the shipment of cotton should interfere with its execution.

I have the honor to be, with great respect, your most obedient servant,
JOHN SLIDELL.

Hon. J. P. BENJAMIN, *Secretary of State*.

P. S.—I have this moment an answer from Earl Russell to the joint note, and annex a copy. The answer came through Mr. Grey, secretary of the British embassy, (and acting chargé d'affaires in the absence of Lord Cowley,) who had received Mr. Eustis very courteously when he handed him the joint note to be forwarded on the 20th.

Lord Russell to Messrs. Slidell, &c. &c.

FOREIGN OFFICE, November 25, 1864.

GENTLEMEN: I have had the honor to receive the copy which you have sent me of the manifesto issued by the congress of so-called Confederate States of America.

Her Majesty's government deeply lament the protracted nature of the

struggle between the northern and southern States of the formerly united republic of North America.

Great Britain has, since 1783, remained, with the exception of a short period, connected by friendly relations with both the northern and southern States. Since the commencement of the civil war, which broke out in 1861, her Majesty's government have continued to entertain sentiments of friendship equally for the North and for the South. Of the causes of the rupture her Majesty's government have never presumed to judge. They deplore the commencement of this sanguinary struggle, and anxiously look forward to the period of its termination. In the mean time they are convinced that they best consult the interests of peace, and respect the rights of all parties, by observing a strict and impartial neutrality.

Such a neutrality her Majesty has faithfully maintained, and will continue to maintain.

I request you, gentlemen, to accept the assurances of the very high consideration with which I have the honor to be, gentlemen, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

JOHN SLIDELL, Esq.,
J. M. MASON, Esq., and
N. DUDLEY MANN, Esq.

Mr. Slidell to Mr. Benjamin.

No. 76.]

PARIS, December 13, 1864.

SIR: Since I last had the honor of addressing you, your missing dispatch No. 42, of 20th September, has come safely to hand. You will have seen by my recent dispatches that my views of the course of the government are almost identical with your own, and that I have been so fortunate as to have adopted in advance the line of conduct which you have pointed out to me. There is one point, however, in regard to which it is proper that I should remove false impressions, viz: that of this government "having refused permission to finish the vessels for delivery to us, after the restoration of peace, and actually forced the builders to sell them to third parties." I do not think that there would have been any difficulty about finishing the vessels for delivery to us after the restoration of peace. I am sure that the builders were never forced to sell them to third parties; and that no pressure for that object was ever exercised towards them by the government. The builder of the Bordeaux ships did, as I am informed, make assertions to that effect, but I am fully convinced that they were pure fictions, gotten up to subserve his own views, he being deeply interested in finding purchasers to whom the ships could be delivered and their entire price paid; while, under his contract with Captain Bullock, full payment was only to be made when the actual delivery of the ships should have been made to him, and such delivery would not have been permitted. I am happy to say that the conduct of Mr. Vorheese, the builder of the corvettes at Nantes, is in strong contrast with that of Mr. Armand.

In my last dispatch I referred to the complaints of Mr. T. S. Bigbee, agent of the Albion Trading Company, of the refusal to deliver cotton in exchange for certificates, in compliance with the stipulations of the contract made with Mr. McRae and myself. I have since received from Messrs. Schroeder & Co., agents in London of the seven per cent. cotton

loan, a letter on that subject, of which I send you a copy. I suggest the propriety of transmitting it either to the secretary of the treasury, or to the secretary of war, as I am in doubt to which of these departments the subject more appropriately belongs.

Lord Cowley, for some reason or other, did not avail himself of his invitation to Compiègne, of which I spoke in my last dispatch, and only returned from London a few days since; but during his absence Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys did not neglect to call, as he had promised, the attention of the British government to the subject of your No. 43, as will appear by the following extract from a letter from my friend at the Foreign Office:

"M. Drouyn de Lhuys a écrit à notre ambassadeur à Londres, au sujet de la proposition de votre gouvernement relative aux marchandises neutres à bord des bâtiments ennemis, et pour connaître l'opinion du cabinet anglais à cet égard. Il en a également entretenu les ministres de la marine et du commerce, en exprimant l'avis que la proposition serait très acceptable. Il attend une réponse dont je n'omettrai pas de le prier de me faire part."

I expect soon to hear the result of this overture to the British government.

I have received the answer of the Holy See to the joint note of 11th November; I annex copy of Cardinal Antonelli's letter, with a translation. As I feel it less decided in its tone than the letter of 3d December last of his Holiness to the president, I do not think it expedient to publish it, and have so said to Messrs. Mason and Mann. Should they, however, entertain a different opinion, I will cheerfully yield to it. I send you an interesting account from Mr. Soutter of his presentation to the Pope.

Our joint note was not of the nature to call for a reply from the government to which it was addressed, nor did I expect any—less, indeed, from Great Britain than from any other power. The letter from Earl Russell, on which I had not time to comment in my No. 75, has for me a greater significance on that account, as his lordship voluntarily went out of his way to say the most disagreeable things possible to the northern government; his reference to the treaty of '83 will, I think, be especially distasteful to them, placed in connection with his twice-repeated recognition of the separate existence of the North and South—as never merged in a single nationality. I should be much surprised if this letter does not call forth a universal howl against his lordship from the northern press.

I learn from Mr. Carvalho de Moreira that the Brazilian diplomatic agents in Europe have received no instructions to invoke the good offices of the neutral powers in the case of the Florida, but he informs me that he has seen the instructions given to the minister at Washington. He is to demand an ample apology; the delivery of the Florida, in good order, with her officers, crew, and armament, at Bahia; and the exemplary punishment of the commander of the Wachusett.

The return of the Florida being rendered impossible by the scurvy trick of sinking her in port as if by accident, I presume that the Brazilian government will demand that she be replaced by another vessel of a similar character and armament. Mr. O. de Moreira says that the Emperor of Brazil is incensed to the highest degree by the outrage, and, being a man of great firmness, will not be satisfied with anything short of the most ample reparation.

I have the honor to be, with great respect, your most obedient servant
JOHN SLIDELL.

Hon. J. P. BENJAMIN, *Secretary of State.*

[From the "Index" of Thursday evening, December 29, 1864.]

REBEL MINUTE OF INSTRUCTIONS RELATIVE TO CRUISERS.

The purpose of the president in requesting that the papers should be referred to this department was to obtain for the guidance of the naval officers in command of our cruisers such further and fuller instructions for the discharge of their duties as the experience of the war has shown to be necessary. These instructions I have now the honor to forward to you for transmission to your subordinates.

MINUTE OF INSTRUCTIONS.

The cases which occur for decision by our cruisers may be classified as follows:

A. A vessel under enemy's flag without cargo, or with cargo belonging exclusively to enemy.

B. A vessel under enemy's flag, with cargo wholly or in part belonging to neutrals.

C. A vessel really neutral, with cargo wholly or in part belonging to enemy.

D. A vessel ostensibly neutral, but really hostile, fraudulently placed under a neutral flag and furnished with fraudulent papers as a cover to protect her from capture.

A. The right of our cruisers to capture enemy's property on the high seas is of course unquestioned. No condemnation by an admiralty court is necessary to vest title to such property in this government. The capture of itself gives instant title to the captors. The property so captured should in all cases be at once destroyed if it be not in the power of the captors to dispose of it otherwise for the benefit of the confederacy. Enemy's vessels thus captured may be armed by the captors and placed under command of any commissioned officer of the Confederate States, and used either as tenders to the captors or detached as independent cruisers. Such vessels, so armed and commanded, are as fully entitled to the rights of national armed vessels as if built and equipped in our own waters. On this point it may be proper to observe that the British government, after violating this principle of public law by the seizure of the *Tuscaloosa* at the Cape of Good Hope, is understood to have admitted its error; and although it has not yet tendered us the satisfaction due for so violent an aggression on our rights, it published on the 2d of June last instructions relative to the treatment of prizes captured by either belligerent; and while refusing them permission to enter British ports, makes an express exception in favor of "a vessel which shall have been actually and *bona fide* converted into, and used as, a public vessel of war."

B. A vessel under enemy's flag, with cargo wholly or in part belonging to neutrals.

Under ordinary circumstances this case would present no embarrassment. The captured vessel would be taken into a port of the captors, or of a neutral country; the portion of the cargo belonging to the neutral would be delivered to the owners, and the vessel, with such portion of the cargo as belonged to the enemy, would be condemned as prize.

The action of neutral governments has placed serious obstacles in the way of doing justice to their own people. They have closed their ports to the admission of captured vessels, and have thus rendered it impossible to make delivery in their own ports of the property of their own

subjects found on board the vessels of our enemies; while it would be exposing those vessels to almost certain recapture to attempt to bring them into our ports, for the captured vessels are almost invariably sailing vessels, and the enemy's cruisers off our ports are steamers. In most instances heretofore it has been found practicable to reconcile to a certain extent the exercise of our own just rights as belligerents with a due regard for the claims of neutrals, by allowing the vessels of the enemy, when partially laden with neutral goods, to be relieved on ransom bonds. But it is obvious that this is a mode rather of eluding than of solving the difficulty, and that we cannot allow to be established as a rule that our enemies may cover their shipping from capture during the war, by simply carrying neutral goods as a part of their cargo. If, for instance, Great Britain will not permit a captured enemy's vessel to be carried into one of her ports for the purpose of their delivering to a British subject his goods found on board, she would certainly have no just ground of complaint that the goods were not restored to their owner. If, therefore, on the renewed representations we are about to make, we find neutral nations persist in refusing to receive the property of their subjects in their own ports, when captured by us on enemy's vessels, it will become necessary to instruct our cruisers to destroy such property whenever they are unable to bring the prize into our ports. In the mean time it is deemed proper as evidence of that respect for the rights of others which has been so seldom extended towards us in this war, that the commanders of our national cruisers should be instructed to continue their former practice of allowing the enemy to ransom his vessel in cases where the neutral property on board is of large value or bears any considerable proportion to that of the enemy; but if a ransom bond is refused, or if the proportion of neutral property on board is small compared with the value of the vessel and hostile cargo, the whole should be destroyed, whenever the prize cannot be brought into a port of our own or of a neutral country.

C. A vessel really neutral, with cargo wholly or in part belonging to the enemy.

Under the law of nations as established prior to the year 1856, such a vessel would have been liable to capture, for the purpose of being brought into port, when the hostile cargo would be condemned as prize, and the neutral vessel and the neutral portion of the cargo would be liberated.

By the Paris declaration of 1856 it was declared that the neutral flag covers enemy's goods, with the exception of contraband of war; and this rule was adopted by the resolutions of congress of August 13, 1861.

In the president's message to congress of December 7, 1863, he pointed out that this concession of belligerent rights in favor of neutrals had been made by the confederacy in return for an obligation entered into by Great Britain and France, that they would comply with the rule of international law on the subject of blockades—also laid down in the declaration of Paris; that both these powers had failed to fulfill their promise, and that the confederacy was thereby released from its obligation towards them. But the president at the same time declared that the principles established by the Paris convention were "more just, more humane, more consonant with modern civilization than those belligerent pretensions which great naval powers have hitherto sought to introduce into the maritime code." He announced, therefore, that it was the policy of this government to forego its right to retract the assent previously given to this rule of maritime law.

The cruisers of the confederacy will, therefore, allow vessels of neu-

trals to pass free, unless laden with contraband of war destined for the enemy's ports. When such vessels are found to be laden with goods contraband of war, the contraband goods, if not the property of the owner of the vessel, are to be taken out, if practicable, and transhipped or destroyed, and she is to be allowed to continue her voyage. But if the owner of the vessel has put on board contraband goods belonging to himself, destined for the enemy's country, he thereby forfeits the neutral character, and the ship is to be considered an enemy's vessel, and to be dealt with as such. No conflict with neutral powers on this subject is to be apprehended, as they have with entire unanimity issued proclamations forbidding their subjects during the present war from engaging in contraband trade, under penalty of forfeiture of national protection.

D. A vessel ostensibly neutral, but really hostile, fraudulently placed under neutral flag and furnished with fraudulent papers to protect her from capture.

Whenever, upon the seizure of such a vessel, she is admitted by those in command to belong to the enemy, and her neutral flag and papers are admitted to be a mere cover, there can be no difficulty in dealing with such a vessel as though sailing under an enemy's flag.

The embarrassment in actual practice may be considered as occurring almost exclusively in cases where an enemy's vessel has been since the commencement of the present war transferred to neutrals. The law of nations on the subject of the right of a belligerent to make legal sale to neutrals *flagrante bello* is not settled by universal concurrence. Great Britain and the United States maintain the validity of such sales when *bona fide*, while France and Russia, and perhaps other European continental powers, hold that belligerent vessels sold to a neutral subsequent to the declaration of war are good prizes to the other belligerent, although bearing the neutral flag. The rule established in the United States was adopted prior to the secession of the Confederate States, and may be assumed to be binding on us until otherwise established by congress.

Our cruisers ought, therefore, to be instructed that where a vessel of the United States has been sold in good faith to a neutral since the commencement of the war, and where the title is so absolutely transferred as to divest the enemy of any future interest in the vessel, she is free from capture. If, however, any enemy's interest in the vessel remain, if she be mortgaged or hypothecated to the enemy, she is as much liable to be dealt with as a hostile vessel as though no transfer to the neutral had been made.

Appended hereto is a list of the enemy's vessels transferred to neutrals since the beginning of the war, and known to be mortgaged to the enemy by the ostensible neutral owners. These and all other vessels in like condition are liable to capture by our cruisers as good prize of war.

It frequently occurs, however, that a belligerent makes simulated sales of vessels to neutrals with a view of protecting them from capture, and, under ordinary circumstances, when the other belligerent has reason to suspect the good faith of the transfer, the suspected vessel is brought into court for adjudication by the admiralty.

This course is now not open to our cruisers, for the reasons above explained, and the only instructions, therefore, practically applicable, under the circumstances, are the following:

The captor should in every case make rigid examination of the papers and documents of every vessel sailing under a neutral flag, known to have belonged to the enemy at the commencement of the war.

He should take into consideration the nature of the trade in which

the vessel is engaged, the national character of the master, the papers found on board, the place at which the alleged sale to the neutral took effect by delivery of the vessel, and every other circumstance tending to establish the true nature of the transfer, and to satisfy his mind whether the vessel be really neutral or merely disguised as such.

If the captured vessel has double sets of papers, or if papers have been destroyed or subducted by her master during the chase, or if she has continued in the same course of trade and under the same master since the alleged sale to the neutral, it may be safely concluded that the property is still hostile and covered by fraudulent use of neutral flag.

In these and all other cases where there is great and decided preponderance of evidence to show that the vessel is really enemy's property, the cruiser must act on his conviction and treat her as such, leaving to his government the responsibility of satisfying any neutral claim for her value.

But whenever the evidence leaves serious doubt as to the true character of the transfer, it will be proper rather to dismiss the vessel, if she cannot be brought into port, than to exercise a harsh and doubtful beligerent right.

There is reason to hope, however, that most of the embarrassment existing on this branch of the subject will soon be ended by a modification of the orders of the British government, which will permit justice to be done to its own subjects. The attempt to cover the enemy's vessels from capture by the fraudulent use of neutral papers has been made almost exclusively by collusion between the enemy and British subjects. This has gone to such an extent that such vessels are familiarly termed by British naval officers "whitewashed." In the report by Commander Wood of his interview with Vice-Admiral Hope, in the harbor of Halifax, we are informed that the British officer inquired what were the instructions in the case of vessels which had recently changed flags or were "whitewashed;" that Commander Wood answered that "unless the papers were clearly fraudulent he would let the vessel go;" that Vice-Admiral Hope then inquired if Commander Wood had seen his communication to Captain Morris, of the Florida, and said that "his government required that in all such cases the vessel should be brought into an English port to have the case decided on or adjudicated." Commander Wood is not certain whether the word "decided" or "adjudicated" was used.

If the British government has, in the interests of its own subjects, become sensible of the impropriety and impolicy of shutting its ports to the introduction of prizes made by our vessels in all cases in which British claimants assert title to vessel or cargo, the instruction will be given to our cruisers to take into British ports all such vessels, there to remain until our admiralty courts have exercised their rightful exclusive jurisdiction over the prize questions involved in such captures. We have, for the present, no further information on this subject than the loose conversation above referred to, and this cannot be made the basis of action by our cruisers.

I have the honor to be, sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant,
J. P. BENJAMIN,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 877.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, February 15, 1865.

SIR: I write this line out of the ordinary course to inform you that yesterday Lord Russell invited a conference with him, at which he made an important and friendly communication. The papers in connection with it, which he said were to be put into my hands, have not yet been received, neither could I report the conversation so fully as I ought to do by this steamer. I therefore confine myself simply to the expression of a hope that the disposition thus evinced, however late, may yet have an effect in checking the irritation that has been lately growing between the two countries.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

Secretary of State.

[Communicated by British Legation.]

Earl Russell to Mr. Burnley.

No. 53.]

FOREIGN OFFICE, *February 15, 1865.*

SIR: Mr. Adams came yesterday, by appointment, to the Foreign Office.

I told Mr. Adams that the cabinet had taken into consideration the complaints which he had made from time to time, by order of his government, of the confederate hostilities in the lakes of Canada, of the raid at St. Albans, and of the vessels built and fitted out in British ports which were afterwards found converted into ships of war, cruising against the commerce of the United States. That the orders sent to the governor of Canada by her Majesty's government, and the proceedings not only of the governor general, but of the legislature in Canada, would, I trusted, convince the United States government that everything had been done, or would be done, to prevent the carrying on of hostilities against the United States from Canadian territory or on Canadian waters.

With respect to the ships built, bought, or fitted out in the ports of the United Kingdom, the question was more difficult. We had tried prosecution, and had to a great extent prevented the equipment of warlike vessels in her Majesty's ports and rivers, to be afterwards used as confederate vessels of war; but this success only rendered the confederate agents more cautious in carrying out their designs. Supposing a merchant ship to be bought and sent out ostensibly to Bombay, another vessel laden with cannon and warlike equipments, with a large ship's company, should be nominally bound to Mexico, and that these two vessels should meet, say at the Cape Verde Islands, and one of these vessels to be there converted into a confederate cruiser, with a confederate captain and a confederate crew: how was such a transaction to be prevented? Would not the plans of the confederate agents and of their friends in the country be kept so secret that no law existing, or to be made, could reach them?

I said that, struck by the difficulties, her Majesty's government had determined to address the confederate commissioners at Paris; and I

then proceeded to read to Mr. Adams the letter of which I inclose a copy. But I said there was always great difficulty in communicating with the confederate authorities at Richmond, and it had occurred to the cabinet that, as the government at Washington must have opportunities of communicating with the confederates on questions which always arise in the course of protracted hostilities, I might fairly ask Mr. Seward, through the organ of Mr. Adams, to convey my letter safely to the confederate authorities.

Mr. Adams raised the difficulties that the confederates might doubt the authenticity of the letter; but, as I told him that the original had been sent the day before to Lord Cowley, to be delivered to Mr. Mason, Mr. Adams acknowledged that difficulty to be removed.

I said that either of the confederates would accept our conditions, or they would refuse compliance, and in the last case it would be for her Majesty's government to consider what was next to be done.

Mr. Adams said that in either case he thought advantage would accrue to the United States; but he feared that the facility with which the confederates had obtained ships for hostile purposes in a neutral country would furnish very dangerous precedents to belligerents in any future war.

I am, with great respect, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,
RUSSELL.

J. HUME BURNLEY, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extracts.]

No. 879.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,

London, February 16, 1865.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit copies of correspondence held with Lord Russell on the subject of outfits of vessels for account of the rebels, as per list annexed.

When I received his lordship's latest note, of the 8th, I thought it susceptible of so triumphant a reply that I had it in my mind to prepare one without delay.

Subsequent reflection, however, caused by information of a peculiar character which had then reached me, modified my views, and determined me to desist from any such proceeding.

* * * * *

I had not been unaware of the efforts in the press and elsewhere to stir up the popular apprehension of what was to follow in case the rebellion should be subdued. I had heard—

1st. That enormous claims for damages for the ravages of the vessels let out of English ports would be immediately presented, to which Great Britain could never give any countenance.

2d. That the rescinding of all the various treaty engagements, especially in connection with Canada, was to be only a prelude to an advance into that country of the great armies liberated from the war.

Seeing the bearing of all these movements to be to stimulate the notion that a quarrel was about to be picked by ourselves, and that the more decided and irrefutable any note of mine to Lord Russell at this time might be, the more it might have a tendency to add to these

suspicious, I deliberately came to the conclusion, for the present, to let the correspondence drop.

It was at this moment I received a note from Lord Russell, asking me to call upon him on Tuesday, at 3 o'clock. I went accordingly. Then it was that I received the communication of which I gave you intimation in my hurried dispatch, No. 877, of the 15th instant, which went out of the customary course in the steamer of that date. I now proceed to report to you my interview.

His lordship said he had asked to see me in order to let me know the result of the deliberations of the cabinet on American affairs. With regard to the state of things in Canada, in view of the instructions which had been sent by Mr. Cardwell to Lord Monck, of the action that had been taken by Lord Monck himself, of the measures in progress in the legislature, and of the decisions of the courts of the province, it was thought that enough had been done to establish confidence there.

With respect to the difficulties that had been occasioned on this side by the proceedings of the confederate agents and their friends, in fitting out vessels and enlisting men to carry on the war, from this country as a base, the cabinet had come to a determination. This was to direct him to address a letter to the three persons who had, some time since, written to him as authorized agents of the confederates at Richmond, on another subject, Messrs. Slidell, Mason, and Mann. These persons were believed to be, all of them, now at Paris. Such a letter had accordingly been prepared. He proposed now to read to me its contents. Accordingly, he read it over slowly and deliberately. After he finished, he said it was proposed to furnish me with a copy for my government. He had already, on Monday, sent the letter to Lord Cowley, at Paris, to be forwarded to its address. In order to be still more sure of its destination, however, he proposed to send a duplicate to Washington, with a request, that, through the channels of communication which appear to have been established between that place and Richmond, it might, if thought proper, be transmitted by us.

I then said that I had listened to the reading of the letter with much satisfaction. That I could not, at the moment, say what view my government would take of it, or of the proposition to transmit it through its agency. I could, myself, perceive no objection. Possibly the other side might be disposed to refuse to receive it, because it came in that way. His lordship remarked that he had first sent it directly to the agents to guard against that difficulty. He alluded to the refusal of the government to permit a vessel to pass, on a former occasion, as having been based upon other reasons which did not seem to apply to this case. I said it had always seemed to me a matter of surprise that some course of this kind had not been earlier taken. The proceedings complained of were of a most outrageous kind. Indeed, so far as I could remember, a deliberate systematic attempt like this to conduct a naval war from the territory of a neutral power was wholly unprecedented. I had regretted it the more that the toleration of it appeared to be establishing a precedent of a most pernicious character in all future cases; and, particularly, to us it was setting an example which would hardly fail to be followed by myriads of loose people among us, who might be induced, by the hope of profit or of adventure, to embark in any cause, no matter how unprincipled or desperate, that promised fair returns of spoils on the ocean. His lordship said that such ships might be anywhere taken; to which I assented, but at the same time reminded him that this was a war of a novel character, that depended mainly upon the

skillful use of modern science, in furnishing vessels of the most speed, at once to overtake the helpless and run away from the strong. In short, it was an emulation in racing in which the governing power took the chances against itself. His lordship did not seem disposed to contest this. He alluded to the various efforts that had been made to stop these outfits under the law, and to the difficulties which had been met with at every step. I remarked that I had become convinced, from the result of the last trial, that the United States could stand no chance before a jury. His lordship said that it was in consequence of doubts of the Crown lawyers, in the case of the iron-clads, as to the possible presence of one or two advocates of the confederates on the jury; that it had been decided to buy them up. People here now took sides, almost as vehemently, on our questions as we did ourselves. It was to be regretted, but there was no help for it. Under the circumstances, they must do the best they could.

From all which it appears, plainly enough, that this measure of a letter has been finally adopted, as the only alternative, after consciousness of the utter failure in a resort to the law as a means of preventing this gross abuse, and of the impossibility of procuring from Parliament any amendment to make it more effective.

The closing remark of his lordship, as I took my leave, was significant. Alluding to the possibility of a failure of this letter in producing any effect, he remarked that the question would be of going on; to which I replied, that I hoped it might prove equally convenient to us whether the one party should be made to stop or the other to go on.

This conference was one of a most friendly character, and convinced me that, whatever might be the desires of the French Emperor, nothing but the grossest mismanagement on our part would effect any change in the established policy of this ministry towards us.

I have since received a note from Lord Russell, with a copy of the letter. I send a copy of the former with the latter, just as it came to me, preserving a copy of it to place in the archives of this legation.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

[Inclosures.]

REBEL RECRUITING IN AND NAVAL EXPEDITIONS FROM LONDON—CASES OF THE CITY OF RICHMOND, THE HAWK, THE VIRGINIA, AND THE NO. 40, OR LOUISA ANN FANNY.

1. Mr. Adams to Lord Russell, January 14, 1865.
2. The same to same, January 14, 1865.
3. Lord Russell to Mr. Adams, January 16, 1865.
4. Same to same, January 27, 1865.

[For the above inclosures see same dispatch under subdivision "Hawk," *post.*]

5. Mr. Adams to Lord Russell, January 30, 1865.
6. Mr. Morse to Mr. Adams, January 27, 1865.
7. Lord Russell to Mr. Adams, February 1, 1865.

[For the above inclosures see same dispatch under subdivision "Virginia," *post.*]

THE SALE OF THE SEA-KING.

Lord Russell to Mr. Adams, February 1, 1865.
[For above inclosure see "Rebel Cruisers," subdivision "Shenandoah," *post.*]

THE LETTERS FOUND ON THE FLORIDA.

1. Mr. Adams to Lord Russell, January 18, 1865.
[For above letter see Mr. Adams's dispatch to Mr. Seward No. 857, January 19, 1865, printed under the head of "Rebel Cruisers," subdivision "Florida," *post.*]
2. Lord Russell to Mr. Adams, February 8, 1865.

THE AJAX AND HERCULES.

1. Mr. Adams to Lord Russell, February 7, 1865.
2. Mr. Dudley to Mr. Adams, February 2, 1865.
3. Same to same, February 4, 1865.
4. Advertisement; paying crew of the 200.
[See "Rebel Cruisers," subdivision "Alabama," *post.*]
5. Lord Russell to Mr. Adams, February 8, 1865.
6. Mr. Adams to Lord Russell, February 9, 1865.
7. Deposition of John Melley, February 6, 1865.
8. Advance note—the Ajax, January 9, 1865.
9. Deposition of George Smith, February 6, 1865.
10. Lord Russell to Mr. Adams, February 9, 1865.

LORD RUSSELL TO THE REBEL EMISSARIES, DEMANDING THE DISCONTINUANCE OF EXPEDITIONS AND ENLISTMENTS FROM GREAT BRITAIN.

1. Lord Russell to Mr. Adams, February 15, 1865.
2. Lord Russell to Messrs. Slidell, Mason, and Mann, February 13, 1865.
[For the above inclosures (except No. 4) see same dispatch under subdivision "Ajax and Hercules," *post.*]

Lord Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *February 8, 1865.*

SIR: I have had the honor to receive your note of the 18th ultimo, calling the attention of her Majesty's government, with reference to the papers therein inclosed, to the proceedings of confederate agents in this country.

I have now the honor to state to you that after careful consideration of these papers there appears to me to be nothing in them upon which any person can be convicted of a breach of the law. Her Majesty's government will apply the law with strictness, but they cannot go beyond it.

I may observe that a great part of this correspondence relates to arrangements to be carried into effect in France, and not in this country.

With regard to your observation that it is for you to point out the operations of confederate agents inconsistent with the neutrality of the United Kingdom, and that it is the duty of her Majesty's government to consider how these operations can be checked and prevented for the

future, I have to point out to you that her Majesty's government, having used all the means in their power to prevent the fitting and arming of vessels in their ports to cruise against the vessels of the United States, and having faithfully carried into execution the laws enacted to preserve inviolate the neutral and pacific obligations of Great Britain, cannot consider themselves bound to answer for the acts of every individual who may evade the operation of the laws by fitting out and arming vessels bought in this country, in some distant neutral port, or on the seas beyond her Majesty's jurisdiction. For such acts no nation does in principle or in practice hold itself responsible.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCOIS ADAMS, Esq., &co., &co., &co.

Lord Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *February 15, 1865.*

Lord Russell presents his compliments to Mr. Adams, and has the honor to inclose a copy of the letter of which Lord Russell spoke to Mr. Adams yesterday as having been addressed to Messrs. Mason, Slidell, and Mann.

Lord Russell to Mason, Slidell, and Mann.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *February 13, 1865.*

GENTLEMEN: Some time ago I had the honor to inform you, in answer to a statement which you sent me, that her Majesty remained neutral in the deplorable contest now carried on in North America, and that her Majesty intended to persist in that course.

It is now my duty to request you to bring to the notice of the authorities under whom you act, with a view to their serious consideration thereof, the just complaints which her Majesty's government have to make of the conduct of the so-called confederate government. The facts upon which these complaints are founded tend to show that her Majesty's neutrality is not respected by the agents of that government, and that undue and reprehensible attempts have been made by them to involve her Majesty in a war in which her Majesty had declared her intention not to take part.

In the first place, I am sorry to observe that the unwarrantable practice of building ships in this country to be used as vessels of war against a State with which her Majesty is at peace still continues. Her Majesty's government had hoped that this attempt to make the territorial waters of Great Britain the place of preparation for warlike armaments against the United States might be put an end to by prosecutions and by seizure of the vessels built in pursuance of contracts made with the confederate agents. But facts which are, unhappily, too notorious, and correspondence which has been put into the hands of her Majesty's government by the minister of the government of the United States, show that resort is had to evasion and subtlety in order to escape the penalties of the law; that a vessel is bought in one place, that her armament is prepared in another, and that both are sent to some distant port beyond her Maj-

esty's jurisdiction, and that thus an armed steamship is fitted out to cruise against the commerce of a power in amity with her Majesty. A crew composed partly of British subjects is procured separately; wages are paid to them for an unknown service. They are dispatched, perhaps, to the coast of France, and there or elsewhere are engaged to serve in a confederate man-of-war.

Now, it is very possible that by such shifts and stratagems the penalties of the existing law of this country, nay, of any law that could be enacted, may be evaded; but the offense thus offered to her Majesty's authority and dignity by the *de facto* rulers of the Confederate States, whom her Majesty acknowledges as belligerents, and whose agents in the United Kingdom enjoy the benefit of our hospitality in quiet security remains the same. It is a proceeding totally unjustifiable and manifestly offensive to the British Crown.

Secondly, the confederate organs have published, and her Majesty's government have been placed in possession of it, a memorandum of instructions for the cruisers of the so-called Confederate States, which would, if adopted, set aside some of the most settled principles of international law, and break down rules which her Majesty's government have lawfully established for the purpose of maintaining her Majesty's neutrality. It may, indeed, be said that this memorandum of instructions, though published in a confederate newspaper, has never as yet been put in force, and that it may be considered as a dead-letter; but this cannot be affirmed with regard to the document which forms the next ground of complaint.

Thirdly, the president of the so-called Confederate States has put forth a proclamation acknowledging and claiming as a belligerent operation, in behalf of the Confederate States, the act of Bennett G. Burley in attempting, in 1864, to capture the steamer Michigan, with a view to release numerous confederate prisoners detained in captivity in Johnson's Island, on Lake Erie.

Independently of this proclamation, the facts connected with the attack on two other American steamers, the Philo Parsons and Island Queen, on Lake Erie, and the recent raid at St. Albans, in the State of Vermont, which Lieutenant Young, holding, as he affirms, a commission in the Confederate States army, declares to have been an act of war, and therefore not to involve the guilt of robbery and murder, show a gross disregard of her Majesty's character as a neutral power, and a desire to involve her Majesty in hostilities with a coterminous power with which Great Britain is at peace.

You may, gentlemen, have the means of contesting the accuracy of the information on which my foregoing statements have been founded; and I should be glad to find that her Majesty's government have been misinformed, although I have no reason to think that such has been the case. If, on the contrary, the information which her Majesty's government have received with regard to these matters cannot be gainsaid, I trust that you will feel yourselves authorized to promise, on behalf of the confederate government, that practices so offensive and unwarrantable shall cease, and shall be entirely abandoned for the future. I shall, therefore, await anxiously your reply, after referring to the authorities of the Confederate States.

I am, &c.,

RUSSELL.

J. M. MASON, Esq., J. SLIDELL, Esq., J. MANN, Esq.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extracts.]

No. 884.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, February 23, 1865.

SIR: I have just come from an interview with Lord Russell. He was unwell, and received me at his own house. I had asked it for two purposes. One of these was to communicate to him the substance of your dispatch No. 1258, and especially to point out to him that portion of it relating to the intimation given by the rebel commissioners of some device to unite the sentiment of both sides on an object not defined, yet not difficult to be conceived.

* * * * *

The other object of my interview related to the contents of your No. 1256. I gave him the substance of it, remarking at the same time that its importance had been much diminished by the later action of her Majesty's government, not yet known in the United States. I then alluded to the reference in Mr. Slidell's letter to some project that had been offered by M. Drouyn de Lhuys through Lord Cowley, in a manner to invite explanations if his lordship felt so disposed. He readily responded. The project, he said, had been little or nothing more than an abstract of that part of the minute of instructions which proposed to save neutral property from destruction, if permission were given to admit it into the neutral ports. It had been considered by himself as inadmissible from the first, but it had been referred, as usual, to the Crown lawyers, who at once pronounced the whole scheme of adjudication on the quarter-deck as involving a departure from the established law of nations, which could not be thought of for a moment. He had in consequence written a letter to Lord Cowley, directing him to communicate to M. Drouyn de Lhuys their rejection of it. His lordship did not know what the French government thought of it, but he presumed it could scarcely have held a different opinion.

I said I had inferred that it must have been so. All that I had been instructed to say was, in case of her Majesty entertaining such a proposal, that we should be inclined to enjoy the benefit of this new interpretation of law by claiming just the same rights on the ocean over neutral property. The matter was not worth pursuing any further. I should, therefore, content myself with simply leaving in his hands copies of two intercepted letters of Mr. Slidell that came with the dispatch, particularly as one of them appeared to contain some remarks upon himself which might be interesting to him.

* * * * *

I forgot to mention in its proper place that I read to Lord Russell that passage of your dispatch which proposes as a mode of meeting the questions growing out of the minute of instructions the exclusion from the rights of belligerents of vessels fitted out from British ports. His lordship replied that the measure had been fully considered, but that the lord chancellor thought there were insurmountable difficulties attending it.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 1232.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 1, 1865.

SIR: Your dispatch of the 10th of February (No. 874) has been received. The President is by no means surprised at the phase which our affairs have assumed in Europe. It does not even excite wonder here that, in London as well as in Paris, we are expected, immediately upon the end of our civil conflict, to begin a course of retaliatory foreign wars. I do not deny that these apprehensions find some ground of support in the angry tone of our press. It would evince equally a want of national sensibility and of national spirit if the American press should fail to resent the insult and contumely which the press of Great Britain has so incessantly hurled against us during our four years of struggle and affliction. European statesmen have failed to accept—European politicians have studiously refused to hear our explanations of our position in regard to foreign powers. Notwithstanding our continual protests, they have persisted in derogating us from our place, equal with their own, as a sovereign power in the family of nations, and, so far as they have been able, they have levelled us to the plane of the insurgents. Under cover of neutrality, subjects protected by the government of Great Britain have lavishly contributed material support to the insurgents, and employed every moral engine to aid them in overthrowing the government of the United States. European politicians do not now mistake in supposing that the people of the United States are indulging a profound sense of injury. It would not be unnatural if that sense of injury should impel the nation, as soon as its hands shall once more be free, to demand redress. Demands for redress are very apt to culminate in schemes of conquest. This, however, is not the policy of the President. He deems conquests unnecessary, demoralizing and injurious to the republic, as he deems revenge and retaliation unworthy the character of a great nation. The sentiments and policy of this government remain unchanged. Every word of peace and good will to foreign states that we have heretofore spoken, and which has been interpreted as the language of policy or of fear, is now spoken as freely as before, when we think that all our dangers are virtually passed. The President does not for a moment think of sending armies or navies with such a purpose or upon such motives as have been indicated into Canada, or the West Indies, or Mexico. There is, however, one necessity that is laid upon him, which he would not be allowed to put aside, if he should desire. He was committed at the beginning of his present term of administration to retake and occupy all the places, posts, and forts which the insurgents had then taken, or afterwards should take away from the government, and thus to restore the national authority throughout the Union. He will be committed at the beginning of his next term to every lawful effort that shall tend to restore the national prestige and influence abroad, just as they stood before this unhappy civil war began. Always confidently anticipating the triumph of the Union, and, therefore, always foreseeing the difficulties and embarrassments of our relations with the maritime powers, which must exist if the end of the civil war should find their injurious policy unchanged, we have, in season, and, our defamers say, out of season, appealed to the maritime States, and especially to Great Britain, to rescind in due time such of their proclamations, orders, and decrees as derogate from our national sovereignty over all territory and over all the citizens of the United States. Incre-

dulity in regard to our ultimate success has indeed seemed to induce Great Britain to reject these appeals, and now the end of our war is likely to find us face to face with that nation in a very disturbed state of relations. British subjects are still sending forth piratical vessels to destroy our commerce and harass us in our seaports, and these vessels are regarded by her Britannic Majesty's government as lawful ships of war. I annex a copy of a telegram just received from Halifax, which shows the dangers of this sort against which we have to guard. Our ships of war are excluded from British ports, while our own ports are unreservedly open to theirs. In this unfortunate situation of affairs we shall exert ourselves not less diligently than we have done heretofore to preserve peace between the two countries. We ought not, however, to be expected to do it without conciliation, or at least some show of good will on the other side. Canada is one of the points where the peace of the two countries is immediately exposed. Judge Smith yesterday adjourned the case of the *St. Albans* raiders eight days, and thus he has again rendered it impossible for us to modify our restrictive measures in regard to that province. There is reason to hope, however, that, if not the judiciary, the executive authorities of Canada will soon take such proceedings as will reassure the border sentiment. In that case the President will hasten to manifest a renewed sense of security and of liberality towards that important province.

Beyond Canada, however, the prospect of reconciliation is clouded. The neutrality law and the Queen's proclamation seem to us to be little better than dead letters in the courts of Great Britain and in the docks of Liverpool and Glasgow. The *Rappahannock*, at Calais, is a receiving ship for recruiting agents residing and operating at Liverpool. The *Shenandoah* is afloat, committing new depredations near the cape of Good Hope; and then almost daily we hear of a new pirate clandestinely built, armed, manned, and equipped, and dispatched from Liverpool. Even Arman's French ram, evading French and Danish laws, employs the services of a British steamer and British merchants to effect its unlawful armament. Can any English statesman expect that the people of the United States will endure an unprincipled maritime war at the hands of any people without resort to self-defense? What then is to be done? Shall the governments of the two countries suffer them to drift in conflict? Must the extinguishment of slavery in the United States, an object so dear to both nations, be atoned for by a deadly war between them? Certainly such a consequence is unnecessary. It would be criminal.

I will suggest what I think may avert the danger. Great Britain, I think, must now know, what hitherto she has so strangely doubted, namely, that to the Americans the Union is the one chief dominating object of thought and affection. If they are angry with Great Britain, it is because they believe, with how much reason it is unnecessary here to say, that the British nation has desired and sought the overthrow of the Union. If now Great Britain is satisfied that this cherished object of American affection is entirely safe—safe equally against domestic treason and against foreign intervention, then let her manifest in some way her contentment with that established fact. I do not say that this shall be demonstratively or even formally done. It may be done incidentally, and even as of chance. Let British ministers, hereafter, instead of speaking of us as a nation that is, or ought, or must be divided into two nations, speak of us as they rightly expect us to speak of Great Britain, as a sovereign state, whose integrity we recognize, and of whose elements and factions we, as neighbor and friend, neither know nor care

to know anything. I think the Queen of England is as popular in the United States to-day as she is among her own subjects. We refuse to understand her allusions to us in her late speech to Parliament as ungenerous or unfriendly. Why cannot British statesmen be as generous to the United States as their sovereign? Then let the vexatious restrictions upon our intercourse with British ports be removed; and let it be shown that the flag of the United States is as welcome in British ports as the British flag is in our own. Let justice not stumble on her coasts, but pursue British subjects on the decks of British vessels who violate her laws, and arrest them, if need be, on the high seas, under whatever flag they shall simulate in carrying on their piratical warfare against an unoffending friendly power. Great Britain knows, I think, how unexact we are, and therefore she knows how easily we can reciprocate peace with peace, and even, if it is desired, friendship with friendship. This done, we shall be able to confer calmly upon such claims and questions as remain to be adjusted in a spirit of friendship and good will.

I do not require you to submit this dispatch to Earl Russell; you may, however, show any part or the whole of it to him if, upon being informed of its character, he shall wish to see it.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Jackson to Mr. Seward.

[Telegram.]

UNITED STATES CONSULATE,
Halifax, February 27, 1865.

Information has reached me from sources believed to be reliable, that four iron-clads are on their way from French and English ports to attack New York City, and that five blockade-running steamers, to be converted into privateers armed with two guns each, are to co-operate with them. Privateers under command of Captain Moffat.

M. M. JACKSON, *Consul.*

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 1204.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 9, 1865.

SIR: I have reserved for consideration in this paper the account which, in your dispatch No. 879, you give of a conversation held by you with Earl Russell, at three o'clock on Tuesday, the 14th of February, upon the subject of aggressions coming from British provinces and ports, and certain papers relating thereto, namely, a copy of a note addressed to you by Earl Russell, on the 15th of February last, and of a note which the earl, on the 13th of that month, addressed to the rebel emissaries, Slidell, Mason, and Mann, at Paris.

While I was reading these papers Mr. Burnley called and left with me,

for my perusal, a copy of a dispatch he had just received, in which Earl Russell has given his own version of the same conversation to which I have before referred.

There is a practical agreement between the two statements; the only difference, if any, consists in greater explicitness of the earl's explanations to you, as they are presented by himself.

* * * * *

In accordance with Earl Russell's suggestion, the Secretary of War has, by direction of the President, transmitted to Lieutenant General Grant the British official copy of Earl Russell's letter to John Slidell, James M. Mason, and Dudley Mann, with a direction to deliver it by flag of truce to General Lee, the general in command of the insurgent forces. I give you a copy of my note written on that occasion to the Secretary of War, and so soon as we shall have received a report from the Lieutenant General of his proceedings in the matter, I will communicate the result to you for the information of Earl Russell.

It is proper to say that, in thus suffering the communication of the Earl to pass its military lines, this government desires to be understood as proceeding upon the ground of comity to her Majesty's government, and as insisting at the same time upon its well-known position, that the rebels are not justly or properly regarded by Great Britain as even a military power with which foreign states can rightly hold any intercourse even upon military subjects. You will make the contents of this dispatch known to Earl Russell.

It is hoped that what we have now done is a substantial proof of the willingness and desire of the government of the United States to renew and strengthen its heretofore friendly attitude towards the province of Canada and all the British provinces.

I think it proper to refrain from expressing any judgment concerning the expediency of the proceeding which her Majesty's ministers have adopted in regard to the violations of neutral rights committed by the rebels in the ports and provinces of the British empire. The United States must continue to insist that the representations they have heretofore made on that subject to her Majesty's government are, in their full extent, reasonable and just. Nevertheless, the President will cheerfully wait the result of the proceedings which her Majesty's ministers have instituted, and he will be ready to respond in every case to whatever efforts the British government shall see fit to make, with a view to remove existing causes of conflict, in a spirit of liberality, conciliation, and friendship.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Stanton.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 8, 1865.

SIR: The inclosed paper has been received at this department from Earl Russell, her Britannic Majesty's principal secretary of state for foreign affairs, with a request that facilities might be afforded for its passage through the military lines of the United States forces. I have to request that the paper may be sent forward to the Lieutenant General, with directions to cause the same to be conveyed to General Lee by flag

of truce. I have further to request to be informed of the Lieutenant General's proceedings in the premises.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

Hon. E. M. STANTON,
Secretary of War.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 1311.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 20, 1865.

SIR: Referring to your dispatch of the 16th ultimo, No. 879, so far as it relates to the transmission through the military lines to the insurgent chief of the British official copy of the note addressed by Earl Russell, under the date of the 13th ultimo, to Messrs. Mason, Slidell, and Mann, I now inclose for communication to Earl Russell, as promised in my dispatch of the 9th instant, No. 1294, a copy of a letter of the 15th instant from the Assistant Secretary of War, which is accompanied by a copy of one of the 13th instant from Lieutenant General Grant, and of the Lieutenant General's letter to the chief of the insurgent military forces on the subject.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Dana to Mr. Seward.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington City, March 15, 1865.

SIR: Referring to your communication of the 8th instant, inclosing a paper received from Earl Russell, her Britannic Majesty's principal secretary of state for foreign affairs, which you requested might be sent forward to the Lieutenant General, with directions to cause the same to be conveyed by flag of truce to General Lee, and asking to be informed of the Lieutenant General's proceedings in the premises, the Secretary of War instructs me to transmit the accompanying copy of a communication and of its inclosure from Lieutenant General Grant, to whom the instructions desired by you were given on the 9th instant.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
C. A. DANA,
Assistant Secretary of War.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

General Grant to Mr. Stanton.

HEADQUARTERS ARMIES OF THE UNITED STATES,
City Point, Virginia, March 13, 1865.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of date 9th instant, transmitting letter of Hon. William H. Seward,

Secretary of State, forwarding communication of Earl Russell, and to inform you that, in compliance with your instructions, I have this day forwarded the same by flag of truce to General R. E. Lee, commanding confederate armies.

I have the honor to be, sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

U. S. GRANT,
Lieutenant General.

Hon. E. M. STANTON,
Secretary of War.

General Grant to General Lee.

HEADQUARTERS ARMIES OF THE UNITED STATES,
March 13, 1865.

GENERAL: Inclosed with this I send you copy of a communication from Earl Russell, secretary of state for foreign affairs, England, to Messrs. Mason, Slidell, and Mann. The accompanying copy of a note from the Hon. William H. Seward, Secretary of State, to the Secretary of War explains the reason for sending it to you.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

U. S. GRANT,
Lieutenant General.

General R. E. LEE,
Commanding Confederate States Armies.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 903.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, March 23, 1865.

SIR: In accordance with the instructions contained in your dispatch, No. 1241, of the 18th of January last, I addressed a note to Lord Russell on the 17th of this month, giving formal notice of the termination of the reciprocity treaty, and inclosing, at the same time, a certified copy of the resolution expressing the sense of both houses of Congress on that subject. This note was delivered by the messenger of this legation at the Foreign Office at 2 p. m., notice of which was entered by him on the envelope, and also reported to me on his return. Not long afterwards I received from his lordship his own acknowledgment of the reception of it. Copies are herewith transmitted.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

(Delivered at the Foreign Office, at 2 p. m., on March 17, 1865, by James Ensor.)

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, March 17, 1865.

MY LORD: Under instructions from the government of the United States, I have the honor to transmit to your lordship a certified copy of

a joint resolution of the Congress of the United States, approved by the President on the 18th of January, 1865, in regard to the termination of the treaty concluded between the United States and her Britannic Majesty on the 5th of June, 1854, commonly known as the reciprocity treaty.

I have the honor further to inform you that I am directed to notify her Majesty's government that, as it is considered no longer for the interest of the United States to continue this treaty in force, it will terminate and be of no further effect, as provided by the terms of the instrument, at the expiration of twelve months from the date of the reception by your lordship of this notice.

I pray your lordship to accept the assurances of the highest consideration with which I have the honor to be, my lord, your lordship's most obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, March 17, 1865.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of this day, containing a resolution of the Congress of the United States, approved by the President, in regard to the termination of the treaty of 1854, commonly known as the reciprocity treaty.

Her Majesty will instruct Sir Frederick Bruce, on his proceeding to Washington as her Majesty's envoy extraordinary, upon the subject.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 1325.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 27, 1865.

SIR: I transmit a copy of a letter of this date, addressed to this department by the Secretary of War, and of the papers to which it refers, relative to the communication to the insurgents at Richmond of a copy of Earl Russell's note to Messrs. Mason, Slidell, and Mann, of the 13th of February last.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Stanton to Mr. Seward.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington City, March 27, 1865.

SIR: The communication of Earl Russell, herewith inclosed, was, at your request, transmitted by this department to Lieutenant General

Grant, to be forwarded to General Lee. I have now the honor of returning it to you, with the accompanying letters of Lieutenant General Grant and General Lee, received by this department this morning.

Your obedient servant,

EDWIN M. STANTON,
Secretary of War.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Dana to General Grant.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington City, March 9, 1865.

GENERAL: This department has received from the honorable William H. Seward, Secretary of State, a communication, a copy of which is hereto annexed, for your information. The paper referred to therein is inclosed herewith. The Secretary of War directs me to request you to please cause it to be delivered to General Lee as requested, and report your action to this department.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

O. A. DANA,
Assistant Secretary of War.

Lieutenant General U. S. GRANT,
Commanding Armies of the United States.

General Grant to Mr. Stanton.

HEADQUARTERS ARMIES OF THE UNITED STATES,
City Point, Va., March 25, 1865.

SIR: I have the honor to forward herewith a communication of General R. E. Lee, "commanding armies Confederate States," of date 23d instant, with inclosures.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

U. S. GRANT,
Lieutenant General.

Hon. E. M. STANTON,
Secretary of War, Washington City.

R. E. Lee to General Grant.

HEADQUARTERS O. S. ARMIES,
March 23, 1865.

GENERAL: In pursuance of instructions from the government of the Confederate States, transmitted to me through the Secretary of War, the documents recently forwarded by you are respectfully returned.

I am directed to say "that the government of the Confederate States cannot recognize as authentic a paper which is neither an original nor attested as a copy; nor could they under any circumstances consent to hold intercourse with a neutral nation through the medium of open dis-

patches sent through hostile lines after being read and approved by the enemies of the confederacy."

I have the honor to be, very respectfully, your obedient servant,
R. E. LEE, *General*.

Lieutenant General U. S. GRANT,
Commanding United States Armies.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 916.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, April 6, 1865.

SIR: I have to acknowledge the reception of dispatches from the department numbered from 1303 to 1316, inclusive.

With regard to the directions contained in Nos. 1309, 1311, and 1315, as well as 1294, previously received, I had obtained an opportunity for an interview with Lord Russell to talk over the matters contained in them on Tuesday last; but upon paying my visit, I found his lordship was so unwell as to be unable to see me. I then left with him the dispatches, as he had suggested, for his information only; and I made an arrangement to wait upon him as soon as he should be prepared to assign me a day.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 922.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, April 12, 1865.

SIR: I have to acknowledge the reception of dispatches from the department, numbered from 1317 to 1327, inclusive.

I have also received in a note from the dispatch agent at Boston, Mr. Emory, a telegram requesting me to send notice to Mr. Perry, at Madrid, concerning Mr. J. P. Hall and the steamer Kearsarge, which I caused to be done yesterday, the 11th instant.

I had an interview with Lord Russell yesterday, and brought to his notice such parts of the contents of your Nos. 1317, 1321, 1322, 1323, and 1325, as you wished him to know, as also the contents of a note I had just received from Mr. Dudley, the consul at Liverpool, respecting the arrival of the Tallahassee at that place under the guise of a merchantman.

He seemed to be gratified with the language of No. 1321. This led to a vague, general conversation upon the subject of the outfits and other operations of the rebels, and the efforts that had been made to check them, from which I recollect no material point to report. He alluded to the receipt of my note to him of the 7th instant, which embodies the general argument on this subject as being of so important a nature that he should be obliged to take the opinion of the cabinet before making a reply. As the members are dispersed in the country during the Easter holidays, it is not probable that a meeting will take place for a week or two.

I think I perceive some beneficial results from the more energetic

injunctions issued to the authorities in the colonial dependencies in checking the abuses of neutrality, which have heretofore been tolerated in almost all their ports. The accounts of the proceedings at Melbourne are very similar to those reported at Bermuda by Mr. Allen in the letter, a copy of which came to me with your No. 1317 of the 22d of March. They must be very embarrassing to the rebel cruisers. Had this government started with such measures at the outset, the effect would have been materially to discourage the prosecution of the schemes, and to deter British subjects from those measures of active sympathy which have given them nearly all their force. The reasons why it did not do so are not difficult to trace. They sprang partly from the natural inertia of the system, rarely to be overcome excepting under the pressure of strong popular feeling, and partly from the inharmmonious temper of the cabinet on the subject of our affairs. It is not quite within the range of a dispatch liable to be published to dwell more fully upon such matters. Enough to say that the course of events has, to a certain extent, modified previous difficulties and inspired more union in the prosecution of an energetic policy. This has shown itself in Canada, as well as in many other places at home and abroad. And although I will not venture to affirm that it has got so far as you desire, the open retraction of the original mistake, I am yet fully impressed with the notion that it will contribute so far as it may indirectly to counteract all the tendencies that have made that measure so mischievously injurious.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 931.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,

London, April 20, 1865.

SIR: In connection with your dispatch No. 1325, of the 27th of March, I now have the honor to transmit a copy of a note to Lord Russell of the 12th instant, and likewise of his reply on the 17th, respecting the copy of his lordship's note to Messrs. Mason, Slidell, and Mann, which was sent forward to the so-called authorities at Richmond and returned by them.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,

London, April 12, 1865.

MY LORD: I have the honor to transmit copies of certain letters which have passed between the military authorities on the lines before Richmond in relation to the document which, in my conversation held with your lordship on the 14th of February, you expressed a wish to have forwarded to that city through the channels of communication established between the contending parties. I likewise have the honor to return the original document itself.

I pray your lordship to accept the assurances of the highest consideration with which I have the honor to be, my lord, your lordship's most obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

[Inclosures.]

1. Mr. Stanton to Mr. Seward, March 27, 1865.
2. General Grant to Mr. Stanton, March 25, 1865.
3. General Lee to General Grant, March 23, 1865.
4. Lord Russell to Messrs. Mason, Slidell, and Mann, February 13, 1865.

[The above inclosures, marked 1, 2, and 3, are published in connection with Mr. Seward's dispatch No. 1325, March 27, 1865, and No. 4 with Mr. Adams's No. 879, February 16, 1865, *post.*]

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, April 17, 1865.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 12th instant, returning the copy of my letter to Mr. Slidell, Mr. Mason, and Mr. Mann, of the 13th of February, and inclosing copies of a correspondence which has passed between the military authorities in the lines before Richmond in relation thereto, and I have to request you to convey to your government the thanks of her Majesty's government for their proceedings in this matter.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 938.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, April 28, 1865.

SIR: In connection with my dispatch No. 879, of the 16th of February, covering a copy of Lord Russell's note to me of the 1st of that month, now forward a copy of a second note from him of the 25th instant, reporting the result of an investigation made at Bermuda on the character of certain steamers which arrived there.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, April 25, 1865.

SIR: In my letter of the 1st of February I had the honor to inform you that due inquiry should be made respecting the proceedings of two

vessels, the Virginia and Louisa Ann Fanny, to which you had called my attention in your letter of the 30th of January.

I have now the honor to state to you that a report has been received from the lieutenant governor of Bermuda respecting these vessels, as well as respecting the City of Richmond, which was mentioned in the letters from Mr. Morse which accompanied your note, and the steamer Ajax, to which the attention of the lieutenant governor of Bermuda had been called by a communication from her Majesty's chargé d'affaires at Washington.

The lieutenant governor states, 1st, as to the Virginia, that she had been at Bermuda, but not since the 25th of January, when she left with cargo for Nassau; 2d, that the Louisa Ann Fanny cleared for Havana on the 8th of March, the day on which the instructions respecting her reached the lieutenant governor; 3d, that the Ajax had not appeared in Bermuda; 4th, that the City of Richmond had been at Bermuda, but had left for Nassau before the instructions respecting her arrived.

With regard to this latter vessel, the lieutenant governor states that as she arrived with the reputation of having been used for belligerent purposes elsewhere, she had been strictly watched, and her state and proceedings had been matters of especial consideration on the part of the authorities. But notwithstanding the vigilance used towards her, and the attention she attracted, the lieutenant governor was not aware of any fact whatever indicating that she broke the law at Bermuda, or was preparing to break it elsewhere. After the City of Richmond had obtained her clearance, the lieutenant governor was appealed to by various parties, between whom disputes respecting her had arisen, to cause the ship to be detained, but the lieutenant governor was advised that he could not interfere.

With regard to the Louisa Ann Fanny, the lieutenant governor observes that she arrived loaded, but that while at Bermuda she applied for permission to ship some saltpeter, rifles, and other merchandise, and that the lieutenant governor, having been advised that there was no sufficient cause for prohibiting the shipment, allowed it to take place. The lieutenant governor further states, that either this is not the same vessel as that mentioned by Mr. Morse in his letter to you, or else that Mr. Morse greatly overrates her draught, which differs little, so far as the lieutenant governor could ascertain, from that of several notorious blockade-runners, and affords no evidence that she was built for other than the blockade-running service. She was closely watched, but nothing was discovered to indicate that her employment was not strictly mercantile.

The lieutenant governor adds, that whenever a ship has arrived at the Bermudas, under reasonable suspicion of warlike intention, she has been strictly watched; that in no instance has it been proved that a ship has armed there, and that, on the other hand, there is good reason for believing that illegal purposes have been frustrated by vigilance.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 1520.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, August 22, 1865.

SIR: I inclose for your information a copy of a correspondence which has taken place between her Majesty's legation and this department

upon the subject of the withdrawal of the notice abrogating the agreement contained in the convention of 1817, limiting the naval armament on the lakes.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Sir F. Bruce to Mr. Hunter.

WASHINGTON, June 15, 1865.

SIR: You will doubtless recollect that in November last formal notice was given to her Majesty's government by the American minister in London, that at the expiration of six months the government of the United States would deem themselves at liberty to increase, if they saw fit, their naval armament on the lakes.

In March, however, Mr. Adams, in compliance with instructions, dated March 8, informed her Majesty's government that the government of the United States were quite willing that the agreement of 1817, in regard to armament on the lakes, should remain practically in force; that the United States had not constructed any additional war vessels on the lakes, and that no such vessel would be built or armed by them in that quarter; and that they hoped the same course would be pursued by the British government.

It may admit of a doubt whether the notice of the abrogation of the agreement has been rendered inoperative by the communication thus made through the American minister, and, as it is essential that no misapprehension should exist on so important a point, I am instructed to ascertain whether the dispatch to Mr. Adams of the 8th of March was intended as a formal withdrawal of the notice given by the American minister to Earl Russell on November the 23d, or whether, as the period of six months from the date of that notice has now elapsed, the agreement of 1817 is virtually at an end, and the abstinence of either party from increasing its force on the lakes, without further notice, rests merely on the good pleasure of each, unfettered by any diplomatic engagement.

Her Majesty's government consider that in the latter case a very inconvenient state of things would exist; and I am directed to add, that it appears to her Majesty's government that the best course would be, that the notice of November 23d should be formally withdrawn, whereby the agreement of 1817 would remain unimpaired, and would continue binding on both parties until six months after fresh notice by either of them of its abrogation.

I have the honor to be, with high consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

FREDERICK W. A. BRUCE.

Hon. WILLIAM HUNTER, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Sir F. Bruce.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, June 16, 1865.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your note of yesterday, relative to the notice given by Mr. Adams to Earl Russell in

November, 1864, and also having reference to a subsequent note of the 8th of March, which Mr. Adams addressed to his lordship, touching the increase of naval armaments on the lakes. In reply, I have the honor to inform you that the instruction to the United States minister at London, upon which his note of the 8th of March referred to was based, was intended as a withdrawal of the previous notice within the time allowed, and that it is so held by this government.

I have the honor to be, with high consideration, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK W. A. BRUCE, &c., &c., &c.

Sir F. Bruce to Mr. Seward.

WASHINGTON, August 19, 1865.

SIR: I have the honor to inform you that I forwarded to her Majesty's principal secretary of state for foreign affairs a copy of the note addressed to me by the Acting Secretary of State on the 16th of June, canceling the notice previously given respecting naval armaments on the lakes.

Her Majesty's government has instructed me, while expressing the satisfaction with which that note is received, to state that they understand thereby that the notice abrogating the agreement contained in the convention of 1817, limiting naval armaments on the lakes, is absolutely withdrawn, and that the convention of 1817 will continue in force unless it shall be hereafter terminated by a fresh six months' notice, to be given by either of the parties thereto.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

FREDERICK W. A. BRUCE.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Sir F. Bruce.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, August 22, 1865.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your note of the 19th instant, informing me "that her Majesty's government understand that the notice abrogating the agreement contained in the convention of 1817, limiting naval armaments on the lakes, is absolutely withdrawn, and that the convention of 1817 will continue in force unless it should be hereafter terminated by a fresh six months' notice, to be given by either of the parties thereto."

In reply, I have the honor to inform you that the statement of her Majesty's government is accepted as a correct interpretation of the intention in this matter of the government of the United States.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK W. A. BRUCE, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 1137.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, January 25, 1866.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit a copy of a written circular received from Lord Clarendon, dated the 20th instant, requesting that information may be given to the British government in cases therein described.*

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

HON. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Lord Clarendon to Mr. Adams.

[Circular.]

FOREIGN OFFICE, *January 20, 1866.*

SIR: As it would be a very great convenience to her Majesty's government to have an assurance that vessels evidently calculated for warlike purposes and alleged to be building in the private ship-building yards of this country, on account of foreign governments, are really intended for the service of such governments, whereby all questions and suspicions in regard to their possible destination would be obviated, I have the honor to request that you will have the goodness to obtain from your government authority to make known to her Majesty's government, as occasion may exist, the mere fact that any such vessels are constructing or are ordered to be constructed in this country, on its account.

You may safely give an assurance to your government, that the object in seeking this information is not for the purpose of instituting any inquiry or of exercising any influence or control in regard to the orders which it may give for building ships of war in this country, but solely that her Majesty's government may know that any such ships which may be in course of construction are really destined for the service of a foreign power not at war with any other foreign power friendly to her Majesty.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

CLARENDON.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Clarendon.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, January 24, 1866.

MY LORD: I have the honor to acknowledge the reception of your circular of the 20th instant, requesting me to obtain authority from my government to make known to her Majesty's government any case in which a vessel or vessels calculated for warlike purposes may be building for the service of the United States in the private ship-building yards of this country.

I shall take great pleasure in complying with your lordship's desire, by at once transmitting to my government, for its consideration, a copy of your note.

I pray your lordship to accept the assurances of the highest consideration with which I have the honor to be, my lord, your lordship's most obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. the EARL OF CLARENDON, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 1687.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 17, 1866.

SIR: I have to acknowledge the receipt of your dispatch of the 25th of January, No. 1137, together with a copy of a written circular, addressed to you by Lord Clarendon, in which you are requested to obtain authority from this government to make known to that of her Majesty any case in which a vessel or vessels intended for warlike purposes may be building for the service of the United States in the private ship-building yards of Great Britain. In reply thereto I transmit, for the information of her Majesty's government, a copy of a letter of the 15th instant upon the subject, from the Secretary of the Navy.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Welles to Mr. Seward.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 15, 1866.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th instant, inclosing a dispatch numbered 1137, from Mr. Adams, United States minister at London, accompanied by a copy of a circular from Lord Clarendon, asking to be informed if there are any vessels calculated for war purposes building in England on account of this government.

In returning Mr. Adams's dispatch I have to state that this government has had no vessel building within the British dominions, nor contracted for any to be built, during my administration of the Navy Department, commencing in March, 1861.

Very respectfully, &c.,

GIDEON WELLES.

Secretary of the Navy.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Dudley to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 60.]

UNITED STATES CONSULATE,
Liverpool, May 3, 1862.

SIR: One of the leading men in Liverpool, engaged in fitting out vessels for the rebels, last night informed a man whom he did not sus-

pect, that they had purchased here in England thirty steamers, a part of which had already sailed, and the balance of which were now being got ready as fast as possible; that they were all to be off before the last of this month, and are to start from some point to be determined upon, and to make a descent upon some part of the United States. The vessels are all to take out arms, and no doubt will be armed when they make the descent. He mentioned all the steamers that I have reported as having been purchased, and one other, called the Semaphore, which has been running between Liverpool and Galway, and is said to be a very fast and superior boat.

The steamer Memphis, at this port, is one of the vessels purchased. She is now taking on arms and munitions of war. She has had port-holes made for cannon. From all that I learn I am satisfied that a fleet is being fitted out with the view of doing something, and quite likely of making a combined attack upon some unprotected point. I deem it to be my duty to communicate the intelligence at once to the department, as I have received it, for what it is worth.

I have the honor to be, sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

THOMAS H. DUDLEY.

United States Consul.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Dudley to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 61.]

UNITED STATES CONSULATE,
Liverpool, May 7, 1862.

SIR:

Deeming the information of the purchase of thirty steamers for the purpose of making a combined attack upon our coast, the particulars of which were furnished in dispatch No. 60, was so important as to require me to lay it before Mr. Adams, United States minister at London, I went there on Saturday evening last for that purpose, and to ascertain what was being done in that city towards fitting out the expedition. I communicated all the particulars known to me, to Mr. Adams and our consul, Mr. Morse. They both manifested a lively interest in the matter. Everything that I have heard since confirms and gives strength to the information previously received. Within the last ninety days the following steamers, all of which have been purchased for the purpose of aiding the South in some way or other, have sailed from this port, and all carrying cannon, rifles, and munitions of war: The Herald, Bermuda, Oreto, Minho, Tubal Cain, and Cumbia. Within the same period there has sailed from Hull the steamer Hero; from Hamburg, the Bahamia; from London, the Economist, the Southwick, the Lloyd, and the Pacific. At Hull there is now fitting out the Modern Greece; at Belfast, the Adela; at Cardiff, the Khersonese, and at this port the Memphis, the Julia Usher, the Semaphore, the Scotia, and the Anglia, to say nothing of the gunboat being built by Laird & Co., at Birkenhead, making, with the other two on their way from Scotland, twenty-two steamers—quite a respectable fleet of themselves. I am satisfied that some mischief is intended. What it is I do not know. The person who gave the infor-

mation says it is to make a combined attack. Their place of rendezvous most likely will be Nassau, but it may be Bermuda or Havana, or some other place that we do not suspect. They will have an abundance of arms at Nassau, enough to arm fifty steamers, and by the returns of cargoes, which are inclosed, you will perceive naval stores in great abundance. One ship, the Southerner, has twelve hogsheads of bread, twenty sacks of potatoes, and nine hundred and forty-two bags coffee.

I have the honor to be, sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant,
 THOMAS H. DUDLEY,
United States Consul.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Dudley to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 164.]

UNITED STATES CONSULATE,
Liverpool, November 21, 1862.

SIR: * * * * * * *

I am satisfied from what I have seen since I have been here in this country that England is the main dependence of the rebels for arms, ammunition, and all kinds of clothing for their army, and that it has been the supplies from here which has fed the rebellion and kept it alive. Hence their urgent appeals, and the great efforts now making here to relieve them. That these efforts are all that I have stated, I beg to refer you to the vessels that have been recently purchased. Within the past few weeks the following fast steamers have been purchased here in England to run the blockade, and are all held by British owners, at least nominally: Iona, Pearl, Thistle, Antona, Giraffe, Eagle, Havelock, Princess Royal, Northumbria, Nicolai First, Douglas, Ruby, Britannia, Wave Queen, and Justicia. Of these, the Iona has been sunk off Greenock. The Pearl, Thistle, Antona, Wave Queen, Giraffe, Eagle, Northumbria, Nicolai First, Ruby, and Justicia have been loaded and are on their way; the others are loading or preparing to load. The steamer Cornubia recently sailed from Glasgow. In addition to these there are now six other steamers in the same service at this port, loading or preparing to load, as follows: Julia Usher, loaded and ready to sail; the Gladiator and Bahama loading, and the Peterhoff, Stanley, and Minnie ready to load. During the last six weeks a large number of sailing vessels have been purchased and taken up to run the blockade, or to carry supplies for the South to Nassau, Bermuda, or Havana. During the same time the regular traders between Liverpool and the West Indies, two or three of which leave every week, carry more or less, and some full cargoes of supplies and munitions of war for the insurgents. There are now six sailing vessels loading here, most of them to run the blockade: the Mary Francis, Speculator, Queen of the Usk, Digby, Chatham, and Peep-o'-day. The Severn, Monmouth, and Intrinsic have cleared within a few days. I have no knowledge of the number of sailing vessels from other English ports, and do not go back to refer to those that have cleared from this for any time back. The steamers I have mentioned are only those that

have come under my notice, and most likely fall far short of those which have been purchased.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

THOMAS H. DUDLEY,
Consul.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Dudley to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 185.]

UNITED STATES CONSULATE,
Liverpool, December 30, 1862.

SIR: Referring to previous dispatches and the subject of building naval vessels in Great Britain for the so-called confederate government in the southern States of the United States, it may not be improper to go over the matter and give in detail all that I know about them, that the department may be fully advised as to the number, character, and probable time when they will be ready for sea.

I deem this the more essential on account of the great importance of the subject, as well as the uneasiness manifested in the large cities at home and the misapprehension as to their numbers.

I have taken much pains to gather information on this subject, and have personally visited some of the yards where these vessels are being built, and from all that I can gather am satisfied that there are four war or naval vessels now building that are certainly intended for the rebel government, as follows, to wit:

Two rams at Laird's yard at Birkenhead, the gunboat building at the yard of William C. Miller & Son, in Liverpool, (the same who built the *Oreto*,) and the large iron-clad steam ram at the yard of James and George Thomson, in Glasgow. In addition to these the Lairds are building at their yard two other steamers, which they say are intended for the Chinese government, and have, within the past few days, laid the keel of a third steamer. The two first named are considerably advanced. Perce & Co., at Stockton, are building a suspicious steamer at that place, and Wigram and Langley are each building a steamer at their yards, in London, both of which are represented to be for the Russian government. These six steamers last named are suspicious. I know of no others now building in the kingdom likely to be for the insurgents.

LAIRDS' RAMS.

The two rams or iron-clad steamers building at the yard of William and John Laird & Co., at Birkenhead, are of the same size and dimensions in all particulars, and are to have the same finish and armament. The keels are two hundred feet long, the vessels when finished two hundred and forty feet over all, depth of hold twenty-one and a half feet, breadth of beam thirty-seven and a half feet, over all forty feet. The stern of the vessels are built out over the screw in such a manner as to protect it. I should judge the projection at the stern to be not less than thirty feet. On the stem there is a strong ram of solid wrought iron projecting about eight feet just under the water-line. The bottoms are nearly

flat, with great bearings to support the heavy armament plates. The engines are three hundred horse-power, and horizontal. In the construction, regard to speed as well as strength seems to have been considered. The hull is to be in water-tight compartments, it is said twelve in number. Some are small, especially those in the vicinity of the ram. The keels and ribs are of wrought iron. The first or inner plates are of iron, averaging one and one-fourth inch thick. Over these, on the outside, are to be iron plates four and one-half inches thick, the armor plates to extend down three and one-half feet below the water-line. On the inside is to be teak-wood ten inches thick.

My information is that the decks are to be water-tight, and so constructed that they can have twelve inches of water on them when in action, the water to be pumped up by an engine. One of the rams is further advanced than the other. They expect to have her ready for launching by the last of February or the first of March next. I should judge she would be completed by that time. The engines are being made in the yard by the Lairds, and will be finished by the time she is launched. This one will be ready for sea about the first of April. The other is a month behind. According to Lairds' plan of distinguishing vessels, (they build by numbers,) these vessels are numbered respectively 294 and 295. It is quite possible that some of the particulars given above are not strictly accurate, and as they approach completion we shall find them so, but they approximate as nearly as can now be ascertained by outsiders. There is no doubt about the character of these two vessels, or the service for which they are intended. They are formidable iron-clad steam rams for naval purposes, and built and intended for the rebel government in the United States, and known to be such by their builders, and so understood by most of the workmen employed upon them. One fact alone shows that the builders know for whom they are intended and purpose for which they are to be used. They studiously make every effort to conceal them, will not permit strangers to visit, and themselves refuse to give the least information about them.

LAIRDS' OTHER STEAMERS.

There are two other steamers building at Lairds' yard. They are numbered 297 and 298, built of iron, and intended for war or naval purposes. They are in a forward state of completion; one will be ready to launch in February next. I have very strong suspicions that these two vessels are also intended for the confederates, and information obtained within the past few days, from different sources, strengthens my suspicions. I will endeavor to gain more certain information and particulars of their dimensions, &c. They give out that they are intended for the Chinese government—a very improbable story, it so seems to me. The keel of a fifth vessel has within the last few days been laid in their yard. She is numbered 299. I understand she is to be a war vessel, but who for I have not heard.

THE GLASGOW RAM.

This vessel is building at the yard of James and George Thomson, in Glasgow. The keel is 250 feet long. Her tonnage is said to be over 3,000, and cost of construction three hundred thousand pounds sterling.

The keel and ribs of this vessel are of wrought iron. The stem-post is of iron, perpendicular, with an immense ram of solid iron projecting

some eight feet just beneath the water-line. I have none of the particulars about her construction other than that she is to be iron-clad, and built for speed as well as strength. The consul at that port has probably given you more full details. She will not be ready to launch before the first of May, unless they push her more rapidly than they have thus far. It is not therefore likely that she will be ready for sea before June or July. From information received from many sources, I have no doubt about this vessel. She is also intended for the rebel government.

STEAMER AT STOCKTON.

This vessel is building by Perce & Co., for Fraser, Trenholm & Co. Her tonnage is about 2,000, so Captain Mumford informs me. The hull is of wood, with a covering of iron plates one and one-third inch thick. The plates have a lap of six inches. This gives almost a double thickness of plates. The timbers and plates are bolted with large iron bolts, and the vessel built in a strong and substantial manner. They say she is for the merchant service. I doubt it, and regard her as a very likely vessel for a privateer. Indeed the names of the owners, Fraser, Trenholm & Co., are quite sufficient to cast suspicion upon her. If for the merchant service, why plate her with iron and secure her with heavy iron bolts in such manner as to give her a thickness of two and two-thirds inches of iron on her sides? She will be ready to launch in February; is within the consular jurisdiction of the consul at Newcastle, who will no doubt report her to the department with full particulars.

MILLER'S GUNBOAT.

Wm. C. Miller & Son are building a steam gunboat in their yard at Liverpool. The hull is of wood, but of great thickness. She is very similar in model and size to the steamer *Oreto*, built by the same firm for the so-called confederate government. In my dispatch No. 173, referring to this steamer, I stated she would be launched in about two weeks, and that the contract for her building had been made directly between Millers and Fraser, Trenholm & Co. From subsequent information I am satisfied that this is a mistake, and that she will not be launched until some time in February next, and that the contract for her construction was made in the name of Fawcett, Preston & Co., and not Fraser, Trenholm & Co. But the money all comes from the last-named firm. The engines and armament for this vessel are being made by Fawcett, Preston & Co. She will be a first-class gunboat, no expense spared in her construction, and like the *Alabama*, and her sister ship the *Oreto*, built for speed as well as strength. There is no doubt about her character. She is to be a gunboat for war purposes for the so-called southern confederacy.

THE TWO AT LONDON.

Of these I know but little. I was told some days ago that Wigram and Langley were each building vessels for the insurgents at their respective yards, in London; that they were iron-clad rams; that the builders pretended they were for the Russian government, but in point of fact were for the confederates. I wrote immediately to Mr. Adams, to Consul Morse, and to Bayard Taylor, our acting minister at St. Peters-

burg, on the subject; as yet I have received no answer from either of these gentlemen.

I have the honor to be, sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant,
THOMAS H. DUDLEY,
Consul.

Hon. **WILLIAM H. SEWARD,**
Secretary of State.

Mr. Dudley to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 131.]

UNITED STATES CONSULATE,
Liverpool, August 15, 1863.

SIR: * * * * * The feeling in this country is so strong for the South, that they are permitted to do almost anything they like. I think sometimes that the whole community are banded together to assist them and to baffle us. I am fully persuaded in my own mind, if it had not been for the aid and assistance the insurgents received from this country, that the rebellion would never have assumed the proportions it has, and would have been ended long ago. Much of the blood shed and treasure spent in putting down this rebellion is justly chargeable to this nation.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

THOMAS H. DUDLEY.

Hon. **WILLIAM H. SEWARD,**
Secretary of State.

Mr. Dudley to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 135.]

UNITED STATES CONSULATE,
Liverpool, August 24, 1863.

SIR: At the bottom of my dispatch on Saturday last, No. 134, I added that George & James Thomson, at Glasgow, were building another gunboat, which I thought was for the confederates. On Thursday of last week I went to Glasgow and took with me one of my men. I obtained a good view of the the ram building by George & James Thomson for the confederates from the river, which is very narrow. She is up high, and so much exposed that I could see her almost as well as if in the yard. Only a part of the armor plates are on as yet, and from appearances I should judge she could not be got ready for launching for two months at least. I was informed that they were not pushing her. This was confirmed from several sources. If this should prove true, and they do not go on faster than they are now doing, it will be four or five months before she will be ready to take the water. The teak wood is all on. The last portion is upright, nine inches thick and about that size in width, and looks like timbers placed over the whole hull of the vessel, side by side, as close as they could put them on. Under this is teak wood, nine inches thick, placed horizontal, making a solid backing

of eighteen inches of teak wood. Over this solid wood-work they are placing the iron armor plates four and a half inches thick. You will recollect in previous communications I have mentioned that this vessel was to have a sharp piercer on the stem, with a steel point for penetrating vessels. This piercer, I learn, is movable, and so made that it can be shipped or unshipped at pleasure. She is very large, and those competent to judge of the size and tonnage of vessels assured me that she would be from 3,500 to 4,000 tons burden. From her appearance I should think they were not far from right. When finished she will be a most dangerous and formidable vessel. I am promised a sketch and minute description of her, which, when received, will be transmitted at once to the department. There is no doubt but that this ram is intended for the confederates. In the same yard the Thomsons have another war steamer nearly ready for launching, of about 2,000 tons burden, with a double gun-deck. My information is that this vessel is also for the confederates. She is to be called the Virginia, is a screw steamer, and to have three masts, full ship-rigged and great speed. She is what they denominate at Glasgow a combination vessel—that is, wood and iron combined in her construction. Her timbers are of angle iron. The bottom planking of the vessel is of teak wood, up as far as the wales, and above that iron. The framework is very strong, and the iron plating heavy; her upper deck flush, and it and the lower deck both pierced for guns. Her engines are making in the yard by the Thomsons, and are to be very powerful. She has fine lines, and will be a fast, powerful, and dangerous vessel. I was told it would be three months before she would be ready for sea, but from the river (and I had a good view) she looked as if she was ready for launching now. The Thomsons give out that this vessel is intended for the Turkish government, but the men working in the yard all say she is intended for the confederates, and that the same parties who superintend the building of the ram superintend the building of this vessel. It is quite likely when launched that another name will be given her, but the men in the yard now know her only as the Virginia, and say that this is to be her name. I endeavored to ascertain the names of all the persons who came to the yard to superintend these vessels. My informant gave me the names of Captains Maury, Sinclair, and Dawson, but was not personally acquainted with either of these gentlemen, and only gave their names as he had been told by others who pretend to know them. Commander Maury and Captain Sinclair have both been in this country looking after vessels for the confederates. This is well known. Sinclair has been boarding at the Bridge of Allen, near Stirling, in Scotland, for a year past. I do not know who this man is that they call Dawson. In addition to these two vessels the Thomsons are building three small iron screw steam gunboats, also for the confederates. These are in the upper part of the yard, and away from the river. I could see them, but was not able to obtain a very good view. I was told they were to be taken apart, stowed as cargo in another vessel, and taken out to the States in this way. That they are to be taken apart is undoubtedly correct, for it would be impossible to launch them into the river from the place in the yard where they are building them. I was not able to learn the size or many of the particulars about these three gunboats, other than that they were for the confederates, so understood by the men in the yard, and superintended by the same persons who superintend the building of the two large vessels above mentioned. It was originally intended to send these vessels out in the Virginia, but my informant told me that this plan had been abandoned, and that it was now understood

that they were to be sent out in some other vessel. I am promised more information about these vessels. Workmen from this yard are to be sent out to put the vessels together after they reach the States.

I think the above information about these vessels is substantially correct. The only thing that puzzles me, and causes a doubt as to their being for the insurgents, is the large amount of money necessary to build them. It seems almost incredible that a rotten concern like this confederacy can command money enough to build these large and expensive vessels in this country. I asked my intelligent informant in Glasgow where they got the money. He answered, very promptly, from the merchants and moneyed men in this country; they loan it to them, and take cotton as security. This seems to be the opinion of many persons here in Liverpool; whether true or not I cannot say. One thing is certain—they have not got it themselves, and it comes from some source here, either from the merchants or else the moneyed aristocracy, who are willing to loan their money for the sake of seeing our country broken into pieces and destroyed. There is no doubt but what every bale of cotton that is run through the blockade counts as so much money in cash here, and gives them an additional credit for double that amount. To this extent they are supplied with funds to build vessels and carry on their operations in this country. If this be the only source from whence they derive their means, it behooves the government at home to look well to this matter. An effective blockade or a destruction of the cotton in the States would effectually destroy their credit, stop their funds, and probably prevent the completion of these vessels. That they are really building a navy in this country can no longer be doubted—not one or two vessels, but a navy. They have three war vessels built here—the Alabama, Florida, and Georgia, now afloat—and are building two iron-clad rams at the Messrs. Laird, one gunboat at Messrs. Jones, Quiggin & Co., in Liverpool, (not in a very forward state of completion,) one immense iron-clad ram, a large double-decked steamer, and three small gunboats at Jas. & Geo. Thomson's, in Glasgow. Nor is this all. While I was in Glasgow one of the firm of A. & J. Inglis, shipbuilders on the Clyde, who was in London, wrote down to his partners to get up a model and estimates for building two steam gunboats for a gentleman who had just arrived in England from one of the West India ports; the vessels each to be one hundred and eighty-five feet long, twenty-three feet beam, nine feet depth of hold, and to draw not more than six feet water; when finished to mount three guns, and have a speed of from twelve to thirteen knots per hour. This is all the letter said. My informant saw and read it. He thinks they are intended for the confederates. I do not think there can be much doubt about it. You will perceive that I have not mentioned in my enumeration of vessels the pirate Sumter, now called the Gibraltar, repaired and put in perfect order at Liverpool, or the steamers Georgiana, Banshee, and Phantom, built in this country expressly for the confederates, and now either in some of their ports or on the coast, and which can be, if they are not now already, armed, or the new steamer built at Stockton, and called the Southerner, and which a few days ago cleared from this port for Alexandria. * * *

I am, sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

THOMAS H. DUDLEY.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Dudley to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 224.]

UNITED STATES CONSULATE,
Liverpool, February 5, 1864.

SIR: The merchants of Liverpool, who have labored unremittingly since the commencement of the rebellion down to the present time, in every way they could, to aid and assist the insurgents in their efforts to destroy the government of the United States, by lending them money, sending them goods, supplies, arms, ammunition, and munitions of war; fitting out vessels to break the blockade, and building and arming war vessels or piratical crafts to burn and destroy our commerce, still anxious further to aid and assist the rebels, yesterday got up a petition in the Exchange in Liverpool, asking the government to recognize the southern confederacy, and then bring about a peace between the North and the South by mediation. It was kept in the room during the day, and signed by about five hundred persons, mostly merchants, many of whom have made their money off their business with the United States, and who are now largely engaged in trade with the cities of Boston, New York, and Philadelphia.

Inclosure No. 1 contains an account of the doings of the pirate Alabama. The ship is from yesterday's Star. It would appear that she has burned a British ship. We shall see if this government will pocket this as she has everything else from the same source. If by accident one of our cruisers should have burned an English vessel, there would have been an outburst of indignation throughout the country.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

THOMAS H. DUDLEY.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Dudley to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 298.]

UNITED STATES CONSULATE,
Liverpool, June 15, 1864.

SIR: *

Inclosure No. 2 contains a copy of the new instructions issued by the government relating to belligerent cruisers.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

THOMAS H. DUDLEY.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

BELLIGERENT CRUISERS.—IMPORTANT INSTRUCTIONS TO GOVERNORS
OF COLONIES.

The following instructions have just been sent by her Majesty's government to governors of colonies respecting the treatment of prizes.

42 A C—VOL. I

captured by federal or confederate cruisers, if brought into British waters:

"DOWNING STREET, June 2, 1864.

"SIR: I think it well to communicate to you the decisions at which her Majesty's government have arrived on certain questions which have arisen respecting the treatment of prizes captured by federal or confederate cruisers if brought into British waters.

"1. If any prize captured by a ship of war of either of the belligerent powers shall be brought by the captors within her Majesty's jurisdiction, notice shall be given by the governor to the captors immediately to depart and remove such prize.

"2. A vessel which shall have been actually and *bona fide* converted into and used as a public vessel of war shall not be deemed to be a prize within the meaning of these rules.

"3. If any prize shall be brought within her Majesty's jurisdiction through mere stress of weather, or other extreme and unavoidable necessity, the governor may allow for her removal such time as he may consider to be necessary.

"4. If any prize shall not be removed at the time prescribed to the captors by the governor, the governor may detain such prize until her Majesty's pleasure shall be made known.

"5. If any prize shall have been captured by any violation of the territory or territorial waters of her Majesty, the governor may detain such prize until her Majesty's pleasure shall be made known.

"Her Majesty's government have not thought it necessary to make any addition to the instructions already given with respect to cargoes, viz: that her Majesty's orders apply as much to prize cargoes of every kind, which may be brought by any armed ships or privateers of either belligerent into British waters, as to the captured vessels themselves. They do not, however, apply to any articles which may have formed part of any such cargoes if brought within British jurisdiction, not by armed ships or privateers of either belligerent, but by other persons who may have acquired, or who may claim, property in them by reason of any dealings with the captors.

"These rules are for the guidance of the executive authority, and are not intended to interfere in any way with the process of any court of justice.

"I have, &c.,

"EDWARD CARDWELL."

Mr. Dudley to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 377.]

UNITED STATES CONSULATE,
Liverpool, November 4, 1864.

SIR: * * * * * No efforts of mine shall be wanting to baffle this enterprise, either in this or any other of the ports of Great Britain, but after the experience I have had I am sorry to say that, with the indisposition of the English government to do anything to stop these expeditions more than they are forced to do, I regard the prospect as exceedingly slim. I am satisfied that the people and local officers in this country afford them every facility and aid in fitting out these

piratical expeditions, and that the government itself, if they do not look on with favor, at least do nothing to stop them, except what they do under the force of pressure or from sheer necessity. It is not pleasant to say or think this, and I should be pleased if the facts and their conduct, judged in the most charitable manner, would justify a different conclusion. The stand they have taken is that they will do nothing without positive proof first made, and they require us to get up or furnish the proof, and they or their laws do not aid or afford us the least assistance in obtaining it. The reason for this is their hostility to us, and desire to see the Union dismembered. I do not think that the insurgents or their English friends will attempt to build any more war vessels here, but what they will do is to purchase vessels that are already built and suitable for privateering purposes, and fit them up and send them out with the armament on board. It may be stowed in the hold as merchandise, or else in some other vessel to meet them outside, as was done in the case of the Georgia, Florida, and Alabama, and more recently in the case of the Laurel and Sea King.

Most likely Leon Smith will purchase his vessel and armament, ship the latter in cases, pretend it is an ordinary commercial enterprise, obtain his crew, with the aid and assistance of the English officials, and sail on his piratical cruise. His guns can be easily mounted at sea, if they are not mounted before he leaves the port. The most we can do is to watch his movements and report to you. I have no idea that we can do anything to induce the government here to interfere or stop him or anybody else who has a mind to enter upon this business. If there was any disposition to put a stop to this business by the government here, it could be easily done. If there was a will, there would be a way. As it is, we have nothing to expect, and must, in my judgment, look solely and entirely to ourselves. We must rely on our navy, and not on the justice of the English people or government. * * *

I am, sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

THOMAS H. DUDLEY.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

AMENDMENT OF LAWS.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 83.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, September 7, 1861.

SIR: * * *

Civil war is a calamity from which certainly no people or nation that has ever existed has been always exempt. It is one which probably no nation ever will escape. Perhaps its most injurious trait is its tendency to subvert the good understanding and break up the relations existing between the distracted state and friendly nations, and to involve them, sooner or later, in war. It is the desire of the United States that the internal differences existing in this country may be confined within our own borders. I do not suffer myself for a moment to doubt that Great Britain has a desire that we may be successful in attaining that object, and that she looks with dread upon the possibility of being herself

drawn into this unhappy internal controversy of our own. I do not think it can be regarded as disrespectful if you should remind Lord Russell that when, in 1838, a civil war broke out in Canada, a part of the British dominions adjacent to the United States, the Congress of the United States passed and the President executed a law which effectually prevented any intervention against the government of Great Britain in those internal differences by American citizens, whatever might be their motives, real or pretended, whether of interest or sympathy. I send you a copy of that enactment.* The British government will judge for itself whether it is suggestive of any measures on the part of Great Britain that might tend to preserve the peace of the two countries, and, through that way, the peace of all nations.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 85.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, September 10, 1861.

SIR: I transmit a copy of an intercepted letter of the 30th of July last, from John P. Baldwin, of Richmond, Virginia, to Henry Adderley, at Nassau, New Providence, relative to the shipment of arms and powder from that place for the use of the insurgents in this country. The existing British statute for the prevention of armed expeditions against countries at peace with Great Britain is understood to be similar to our act of Congress of the 5th of April, 1818. Proceedings like that referred to in the letter of Baldwin, however, afford us special reason to expect legislation on the part of the British government of the character of our act of 1838, referred to in my instruction to you of the 7th instant, numbered 83. It may be, however, that the British executive government now has the power to prevent the exportation of contraband of war from British colonies near the United States, for the use of the insurgents in the South. Should this be the fact, you will bring the subject to the attention of Lord Russell, and request that proper instructions in regard to it may be given to the colonial authorities.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 79.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,

London, November 29, 1861.

SIR:

Last evening I received the more formal answer, (to his note of the

* See United States Statutes at Large, vol. 5, p. 212.

† For inclosure see Mr. Adams's dispatch to Mr. Seward, No. 53, October 4, 1861, printed under "Enforcement of Neutrality"—"General Subject," ante.

22d of November, to Lord Russell) a copy of which will accompany this.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

FOREIGN OFFICE, November 28, 1861.

SIR:

Having thus answered Mr. Adams upon the two points to which his attention was called, the undersigned has only further to say that if, in order to maintain inviolate the neutral character which her Majesty has assumed, her Majesty's government should find it necessary to adopt further measures, within the limits of public law, her Majesty will be advised to adopt such measures.

The undersigned requests Mr. Adams to accept the assurance of his highest consideration.

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 160.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, May 15, 1862.

SIR:

I now transmit the copy of my reply to Lord Russell's note, a copy of which is already on its way to you, with my dispatch No. 158, of the 9th instant. Since that date I have received a note from his lordship, dated the 10th, in answer to mine addressed to him on the 8th, to which I felt it my duty to make a rejoinder on the 12th instant. Copies of these two notes likewise accompany this dispatch.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

[Extract.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, May 10, 1862.

MY LORD: I have the honor to acknowledge the reception of your lordship's note of the 7th instant, touching the case of the British vessel Emily St. Pierre.

I cannot restrain the expression of my profound regret to your lord-

ship that by reason of the absence of a just and necessary power in her Majesty's government this wrongdoer should thus have the opportunity of escaping with impunity from suffering the proper penalty for his fraudulent attempt. I am the more deeply sensible of my disappointment from the fact that I had been led to hope for an opposite result from the language of her Majesty's proclamation, issued on the 13th day of May last, and evidently intended to apply to precisely the class of cases to which this of the *Emily St. Pierre* appears to belong. The closing paragraph of that paper expressly warns all her Majesty's subjects, and all persons whatsoever entitled to her protection, that if any of them shall presume, "in contempt of that, her royal proclamation, and of her high displeasure, to do any acts in derogation of their duty as subjects of a neutral sovereign, in the said contest, or in violation or contravention of the law of nations in that behalf, as, for example, * * * by breaking, or endeavoring to break, any blockade lawfully and actually established by or on behalf of either of the said contending parties, * * * all parties so offending will incur and be liable to the several penalties and penal consequences of the said statute, or by the law of nations in that behalf imposed or denounced."

If it be not implied by the language to which I have taken the liberty to call your lordship's attention, that there is a jurisdiction existing in Great Britain capable of taking cognizance of cases arising under the law of nations, and beyond the range of the municipal law, then does it appear, at least to my judgment, that the proclamation has been most unfortunately worded, for it can scarcely be denied that the government of the United States, which it was certainly intended in part to protect, had a just right to infer from it the power as well as the will of her Majesty's government to shelter it against such wrongful and fraudulent acts of her ill-intentioned subjects as have been committed in the case of the ship *Emily St. Pierre*.

Praying your lordship's pardon for the trouble I have given you in this case, and trusting that I may find justification for my very natural mistake, I beg to renew to your lordship the assurance of the highest consideration with which I have the honor to be, my lord, your most obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

FOREIGN OFFICE, May 10, 1862.

SIR: In the letter I had the honor to receive from you yesterday, you appear to have confounded two things totally distinct.

The foreign enlistment act is intended to prevent the subjects of the Crown from going to war when the sovereign is not at war. Thus private persons are prohibited from fitting out a ship of war in our ports, or from enlisting in the service of a foreign state at war with another state, or in the service of insurgents against a foreign sovereign or state. In these cases the persons so acting would carry on war, and thus might engage the name of their sovereign and of their nation in belligerent operations. But owners and masters of merchant ships carrying warlike stores do nothing of the kind. If captured for breaking a blockade or

carrying contraband of war to the enemy of the captor, they submit to capture, are tried, and condemned to lose their cargo. This is the penalty which the law of nations has affixed to such an offense, and in calling upon her Majesty's government to prohibit such adventurers, you in effect call upon her Majesty's government to do that which it belongs to the cruisers and the courts of the United States to do for themselves.

* * * * *

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, May 12, 1862.

MY LORD: I have the honor to acknowledge the reception of your note of the 10th instant. From the purport of it I am led to fear that I may have been unfortunate heretofore in my attempts to express my own meaning. If I have appeared to your lordship to confound two things so very dissimilar as the penalties of the enlistment act and the liabilities which follow from the attempt to break a blockade, I can only say that the fault must be laid to my want of ability to use words properly to express my thoughts.

The position which I did mean to take was this: that the *intent* of the enlistment act, as explained by the words of its preamble, was to prevent the unauthorized action of subjects of Great Britain, disposed to embark in the contests of foreign nations, from involving the country in the risk of a war with those countries. This view of the law does not seem to be materially varied by your lordship. When speaking of the same thing you say that the law applies to cases where "private persons so acting would carry on, and thus might engage the name of their sovereign and of their nation in belligerent operations." It is further shown by that preamble that that act was an additional act of prevention, made necessary by experience of the inefficiency of former acts passed to effect the same object.

But it is now made plain that whatever may have been the skill with which this latest act was drawn, it does not completely fulfill its intent, because it is very certain that many British subjects are now engaged in undertakings of a hostile character to a foreign state which, though not technically within the strict letter of the enlistment act, are as much contrary to its spirit as if they levied war directly. Their measures embrace all of the operations preliminary to openly carrying on war—the supply of men, and ships, and arms, and money, to one party in order that they may be the better enabled to overcome the other, which other is in this case a nation with which Great Britain is now under treaty obligations of the most solemn nature to maintain a lasting peace and friendship. The government of the United States having, in the course of its hostile operations, had occasion to experience the injurious effects of this virtual levying of war against itself from the ports of a friendly power, and seeing the obstacle in the way of the removal of them to be alleged to be the inefficiency of a statute intended to effect that object, does not regard it as asking anything unreasonable, or more than it would in like case be willing itself to grant, if it solicits some action to render effective the

spirit as well of the law as of her Majesty's enunciation of the national will.

I perceive that your lordship appears to be of opinion that, in this proceeding, the government of the United States is asking more than is reasonable. It is, in your view, sufficient to declare that owners and masters of merchant ships, fitted out with intent to break a blockade or carry contraband of war to one of two parties engaged in war, are subject to capture, trial, and condemnation, if caught by the offended party; and hence, in this case, that the government of the United States, in calling upon her Majesty's government to prohibit such adventures, is in effect calling upon it to do that which it ought to do, and fails to be able to do for itself. The only valid plea, your lordship remarks, for asking interposition, is, that the blockade is in reality ineffective; and this, you very justly presume, I shall not be disposed to urge.

But I pray your lordship's pardon if I submit that you appear to have entirely overlooked another plea, which I am confident enough to imagine of no inconsiderable weight. That plea is that the kingdom of Great Britain endeavor in spirit as well as in the letter to preserve the principle of neutrality, if not of friendship, towards a foreign power in amity with it to which it has pledged itself. The precise mode in which that shall be done, it does not presume to prescribe. That the toleration of such conduct in subjects of Great Britain, as I have had the pain heretofore to expose, is surely a violation of that neutrality, is justly to be inferred from the very language of her Majesty's proclamation; for it is therein declared that precisely such acts of theirs as I have been compelled to complain of are done "in derogation of their duty to her as a neutral sovereign, and incur her high displeasure." If such, then, be the true character of the proceedings to which I have heretofore called your lordship's attention, they surely merit something more of notice from her Majesty's ministers than an intimation that they will be suffered to pass unreprieved unless the punishment shall be inflicted by the nation whom they are designed to injure. The object of the government of the United States has not been to relieve itself of the duty of vigilance to capture offenders against the law. It has rather been to avoid the necessity of applying additional stringent measures for their own security against British subjects found to be engaged in such illicit enterprises, made imperative by the conviction that no preventive co-operation whatever can be expected from her Majesty's government. It has rather been to avoid the risk of confounding the innocent with the guilty, because all happen to be involved in a general suspicion. And, lastly, it has rather been to remove, at as early a day as may be, consistently with its own safety, the restrictions on the trade with foreign countries, which these evil doers are laboring with so much industry to protract. Your lordship's language leaves me little hope of any co-operation of her Majesty's government to these ends. Nevertheless, I trust I may be permitted to indulge the belief that the time is not now far distant when the difficulties thus interposed in the way of its progress will have been so far removed by its own unassisted action as to relieve both countries from the painful necessity of further continuing the discussion.

Renewing to your lordship the assurance of my highest consideration, I have the honor to be, my lord, your most obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

[Transmitted with Mr. Adams's dispatch, No. 174, to Mr. Seward, dated June 13, 1862.]

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

FOREIGN OFFICE, *June 12, 1862.*

SIR: *

The principle on which the foreign enlistment act is founded is broadly distinguishable from, and is a plain exception to, what I have now stated. Attempts on the part of the subjects of a neutral government to take part in a war, or to make use of the neutral territory as an arsenal or barrack for the preparation and inception of direct and immediate hostilities against a State with which their government is at peace, as by enlisting soldiers or fitting out ships of war, and so converting, as it were, neutral territory into a hostile depot or post in order to carry on hostilities therefrom, have an obvious tendency to involve in the war the neutral government which tolerates such proceedings. Such attempts, if unchecked, might imply, at least, an indirect participation in hostile acts, and they are, therefore, consistently treated by the government of the neutral state as offences against its public policy and safety, which may thereby be implicated.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 381.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, October 25, 1862.

SIR: I send herewith copies of papers which have just been received from James E. Harvey, esq., our minister at Lisbon, touching the depredations of piratical vessels, built, armed, manned, and equipped in British ports, and dispatched from such ports, upon the American merchant vessels on the high seas near the island of Flores.

The President desires that you lay copies, or the substance of them, before Earl Russell in such manner as shall seem best calculated to effect two important objects: First, namely, due redress for the national and private injuries sustained; and secondly, a prevention of such lawless and injurious proceedings hereafter.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[For inclosure see same dispatch under "Rebel Cruisers," subdivision "Alabama," *post.*]

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 383.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, October 27, 1862.

SIR: You will receive herewith the resolutions of the Chambers of Commerce of the State of New York, on the subject of the recent destruc-

tion at sea of American vessels near the Azores by pirates, who went forth upon that unlawful errand from British ports and waters.

You will judge how far the submission of these resolutions, which are so just in themselves, and so humane, to the notice of Earl Russell may conduce to the desired ends of redress for the past, and prevention for the future, which are indicated in another instruction sent to you under this date.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[For inclosure see same dispatch under "Rebel Cruisers," subdivision "Alabama," *post.*]

[Transmitted with dispatch No. 262 of Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward, dated November 20, 1862.]

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

[Extract.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, November 20, 1862.

MY LORD : *

Armed by the authority of such a precedent, having done all in my power to apprise her Majesty's government of the illegal enterprise in ample season for effecting its prevention, and being now enabled to show the injurious consequences to innocent parties relying upon the security of their commerce from any danger through British sources ensuing from the omission of her Majesty's government, however little designed, to apply the proper prevention in due season, I have the honor to inform your lordship of the directions which I have received from my government to solicit redress for the national and private injuries already thus sustained, as well as a more effective prevention of any repetition of such lawless and injurious proceedings in her Majesty's ports hereafter.

I pray your lordship to receive the assurances of the very high consideration with which I remain your most obedient servant.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 281.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, December 25, 1862.

SIR : I transmit herewith a copy of Lord Russell's note to me of the 19th instant, in reply to my representation, dated the 20th of November, in the case of the "200."

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

FOREIGN OFFICE, *December 10, 1862.*

SIR: *

As regards your demand for a more effective prevention for the future of the fitting out of such vessels in British ports, I have the honor to inform you that her Majesty's government, after consultation with the law officers of the Crown, are of opinion that certain amendments might be introduced into the foreign enlistment act, which, if sanctioned by Parliament, would have the effect of giving greater power to the Executive to prevent the construction in British ports of ships destined for the use of belligerents. But her Majesty's government consider that, before submitting any proposals of that sort to Parliament, it would be desirable that they should previously communicate with the government of the United States, and ascertain whether that government is willing to make similar alterations in its own foreign enlistment act; and that the amendments, like the original statute, should, as it were, proceed *pari passu* in both countries.

I shall accordingly be ready at any time to confer with you, and to listen to any suggestions which you may have to make by which the British foreign enlistment act, and the corresponding statute of the United States, may be made more efficient for their purpose.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 454.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 19, 1863.

SIR: *

It is not presumed that our anti-enlistment statute is defective, or that Great Britain has ground to complain that it has not been effectually executed. Nevertheless, the proposition of her Majesty's government that the two governments shall confer together upon amendments to the corresponding acts in the two countries, evinces a conciliatory, a liberal, and just spirit, if not a desire to prevent future causes of complaint. You are therefore authorized to confer with Earl Russell, and to transmit for the consideration of the President such amendments as Earl Russell may, in such a conference, suggest and you may think proper to be approved.

You will receive herewith a copy of some treasonable correspondence of the insurgents at Richmond with their agents abroad, which throws a flood of light upon the naval preparations they are making in Great Britain. You will use these papers in such a manner as shall be best calculated to induce the British government to enforce its existing laws, and, if possible, to amend them so as to prevent the execution of the unlawful designs which will thus be brought to their notice in a man-

ner which will admit of no question in regard to the sufficiency of evidence.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq, &c., &c., &c.

[For inclosed correspondence see Mr. Adams to Lord Russell of February 9, 1863, with his dispatch, No. 322, to Mr. Seward of February 13, 1863, under "Enforcement of Neutrality"—"General Subject," *ante*.]

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 321.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,

London, February 13, 1863.

SIR: In obedience to your instructions contained in dispatch No. 451, I called the attention of Lord Russell, in my conference of Saturday, to the reply made by him to my note of the 20th of November last, claiming reparation for the damage done by No. 290, and security against any repetition of the same in future. I observed that my government had not yet authorized me to say anything in regard to the answer on the first point; but with respect to the second, his lordship's suggestion of possible amendments to the enlistment laws in order to make them more effective had been favorably received. Although the law of the United States was considered as of very sufficient vigor, the government were not unwilling to consider propositions to improve upon it.

To that end I had been directed to ask whether any such had yet been matured by her Majesty's ministers; if so, I should be happy to receive and to transmit them to Washington. His lordship, repeating my remark that my government considered its present enlistment law as sufficiently effective, then added that since his note was written the subject had been considered in the cabinet, and the lord chancellor had expressed the same opinion of the British law. Under these circumstances he did not see that he could have any change to propose.

I replied that I should report this answer to my government. What explanation the government was ready to give for its utter failure to execute a law confessed to be effective did not then appear.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

Secretary of State.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 3, 1863, p. 48.]

No. 22.

Earl Russell to Lord Lyons.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *February 14, 1863.*

MY LORD: I had a conversation a few days ago with Mr. Adams on the subject of the "Alabama."

It did not appear that his government desired to carry on the controversy on this subject from Washington; they rather left the conduct of the argument to Mr. Adams.

On a second point, however, namely, whether the law with respect to

equipment of vessels for hostile purposes might be improved, Mr. Adams said that his government were ready to listen to any propositions her Majesty's government had to make, but they did not see how their own law on this subject could be improved.

I said that the cabinet had come to a similar conclusion; so that no further proceedings need be taken at present on this subject.

I am, &c.,

RUSSELL.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 483.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 19, 1863.

SIR:

This government is very desirous to avert occasions of irritation and complaint, which necessarily tend to produce alienation between even the most friendly powers. And it is more especially inclined to this policy in its intercourse with Great Britain. The President is therefore most hopeful that her Majesty's government will act upon the idea of which an intimation has been given by Earl Russell, namely, of proposing some amendments to the foreign enlistment acts of the two countries. You may, perhaps, mention the subject to Earl Russell informally, with some advantage.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 493.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
Washington, March 2, 1863.

SIR: Your dispatch of the 13th of February (No. 321) has been received.

It informs us that, on a re-examination of the subject, her Majesty's government have come to a conclusion that the present enlistment law of Great Britain is sufficient without amendments, and that therefore they have none to propose. It remains for this government, therefore, only to say that it will be your duty to urge upon her Majesty's government the desire and expectation of the President, that henceforward her Majesty's government will take the necessary measures to enforce the execution of the law as faithfully as this government has executed the corresponding statutes of the United States. In placing before Earl Russell intercepted correspondence of the insurgents, as we learn that you have done by another of your dispatches, the President thinks that you have given to the British government ample evidence of the seriousness of our complaint, as well as sufficient information of specific unlawful designs of the parties concerned therein, and the plans of operation, to secure success to any proper efforts for repressing those designs which her Majesty's government may think proper to put forth.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 1, 1864, p. 2.]

No. 3.

Earl Russell to Lord Lyons.

[Extract.]

FOREIGN OFFICE, *March 27, 1863.*

MY LORD:

Mr. Adams said there was one thing which might be easily done. It was supposed the British government were indifferent to these notorious violations of their own laws. Let them declare their condemnation of all such infractions of law.

With respect to the [enlistment] law itself, Mr. Adams said either it was sufficient for the purposes of neutrality, and then let the British government enforce it; or it was insufficient, and then let the British government apply to Parliament to amend it.

I said that the cabinet were of opinion that the law was sufficient; but that legal evidence could not always be procured; that the British government had done everything in its power to execute the law.

I am, &c.,

RUSSELL.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 651.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, July 11, 1863.

SIR:

I may safely protest, in behalf of the United States, against the assumption of that position by the British nation, because this government, with a statute exactly similar to that of Great Britain, does constantly hold itself able and bound to prevent such injuries to Great Britain. The President thinks it not improper to suggest for the consideration of her Majesty's government the question whether, on appeal to be made by them, Parliament might not think it just and expedient to amend the existing statute in such a way as to effect what the two governments actually believe it ought now to accomplish. In case of such an appeal the President would not hesitate to apply to Congress for an equivalent amendment of the laws of the United States, if her Majesty's government should desire such a proceeding, although here such an amendment is not deemed necessary.

If the law of Great Britain must be left without amendment, and be construed by the government in conformity with the rulings of the chief baron of the exchequer, then there will be left to the United States no alternative but to protect themselves and their commerce against armed cruisers proceeding from British ports, as against the naval forces of a public enemy, and also to claim and insist upon indemnities for the injuries which all such expeditions have hitherto committed or shall hereafter commit against this government and the citizens of the United States.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 453.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, July 16, 1863.

SIR: *

In connection with this subject I beg to call your attention to the reply, addressed by Mr. Hammond, on behalf of Lord Russell, to the signers of the Liverpool memorial, suggesting some alteration in the enlistment act. Both papers are printed in the copy of the Times of the 13th instant, which I transmit. It may be inferred from this that the government will persist in their efforts to enforce the provisions of the enlistment act through the courts, reserving to themselves an avenue of escape by reason of any failure to be supplied with evidence of intent to violate them. Whether they expect the duty of looking this up to be performed by us, or they design to seek it also from other sources, does not clearly appear.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

[From British Blue Book, "North America," No. 13, 1863.]

Memorial from certain ship-owners of Liverpool, suggesting an alteration in the foreign enlistment act.

No. 1.

MEMORIAL.

To the right honorable the Earl Russell, her Majesty's principal secretary of state for the foreign department.

The memorial of the undersigned ship-owners of Liverpool sheweth, that your memorialists, who are deeply interested in British shipping, view with dismay the probable future consequences of a state of affairs which permits a foreign belligerent to construct in and send to sea from British ports vessels of war, in contravention of the provisions of the existing law.

That the immediate effect of placing at the disposal of that foreign belligerent a very small number of steam-cruisers has been to paralyze the mercantile marine of a powerful maritime and naval nation, inflicting within a few months losses, direct and indirect, on its ship-owning and mercantile interests which years of peace may prove inadequate to retrieve.

That your memorialists cannot shut their eyes to the probability that in any future war between England and a foreign power, however insignificant in naval strength, the example now set by subjects of her Majesty while England is neutral may be followed by citizens of other countries neutral when England is belligerent; and that the attitude of

helplessness in which her Majesty's government have declared their inability to detect and punish breaches of the law notoriously committed by certain of her Majesty's subjects may hereafter be successfully imitated by the governments of those other countries in answer to English remonstrances.

That the experience of late events has proved to the conviction of your memorialists that the possession by a belligerent of swift steam-cruisers, under no necessity, actual or conventional, to visit the possibly blockaded home ports of that belligerent, but able to obtain all requisite supplies from neutrals, will become a weapon of offense against which no preponderance of naval strength can effectually guard, and the severity of which will be felt in the ratio of the shipping and mercantile wealth of the nation against whose mercantile marine the efforts of those steam-cruisers may be directed.

That the effect of future war with any power thus enabled to purchase, prepare, and refit vessels of war in neutral ports will inevitably be to transfer to neutral flags that portion of the sea-carrying trade of the world which is now enjoyed by your memorialists and by other British ship-owners.

That over and above the chances of pecuniary loss to themselves, your memorialists share in the regret with which a law-regarding community must naturally look on successful attempts to evade the provisions of an act of Parliament passed for a single and simple purpose, but which has been found not to give the executive all the powers needed for its effective execution.

That your memorialists would accordingly respectfully urge upon your lordship the expediency of proposing to Parliament to sanction the introduction of such amendments into the foreign enlistment act as may have the effect of giving greater power to the executive to prevent the construction in British ports of ships destined for the use of belligerents.

And your memorialists would further suggest to your lordship the importance of endeavoring to secure the assent of the governments of the United States of America, and of other foreign countries, to the adoption of similar regulations in those countries also.

All which your memorialists respectfully submit.

Lamport & Holt.

James Baines & Co.

Richard Nicholson & Son.

W. B. Boadle.

J. Prowse & Co.

Currie, Newton & Co.

Nelson, Alexander & Co.

Kendall Brown.

G. S. H. Fletcher & Co.

J. Aikin.

Finlay, Campbell & Co.

Cropper, Ferguson & Co.

J. Campbell.

S. R. Graves.

Rankin, Gilmour & Co.

Rathbone Bros. & Co.

James Brown & Co.

James Poole & Co.

W. Jacob & Co.

Henry Moore & Co.

Imrie & Tomlinson.

Thomas Chilton.

Jones, Palmer & Co.

Farnworth & Jardine.

Thomas & James Harrison.

L. H. Macintyre.

Potter Brothers.

Chas. Geo. Cowie & Co.

W. J. Seally.

B. Girvin & Co.

C. T. Bowring & Co.

LIVERPOOL, *June 9, 1863.*

No. 2.

Mr. Hammond to Messrs. Lamport & Holt and others.

FOREIGN OFFICE, July 6, 1863.

GENTLEMEN: I am directed by Earl Russell to acknowledge the receipt of the memorial dated the 9th of June, signed by you and others of the merchants at Liverpool, in which you urge upon his lordship the expediency of proposing to Parliament such amendments to the foreign enlistment act as shall enable the government to prevent the construction in British ports of ships destined for the use of belligerents.

I am to state to you in reply, that in Lord Russell's opinion the foreign enlistment act is effectual for all reasonable purposes, and to the full extent to which international law or comity can require, provided proof can be obtained of any act done with the intent to violate it.

Even if the provisions of the act were extended, it would still be necessary that such proof should be obtained, because no law could or should be passed to punish upon suspicion instead of upon proof.

I am, &c.,

E. HAMMOND.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 493.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, September 10, 1863.

SIR:

But a still more significant manifestation of the altered tone of the government is to be found in the speech made by Lord Russell at the opening of the new park at Dundee, yesterday, a report of which is published in the newspapers of this morning. He seems to have rather gone out of his way to take up the subject, in order to announce the policy of the government. You will not fail to observe the greatly increased firmness of his language, and more especially his intimation that new powers may be solicited from Parliament, if those now held should prove insufficient. This is, at least, the true tone. I confess that I have more hopes of our prospect of being able to preserve friendly relations than at any moment since my arrival in England. Unless some new and untoward event should occur to make other complications, I see no barrier of a serious character to our continuance in peace.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

HON. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

Secretary of State.

[Transmitted with Mr. Adams's dispatch to Mr. Seward, No. 497, of September 17, 1863.]

Mr. Adams to Lord Russell.

[Extract.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, September 16, 1863.

MY LORD:

And here your lordship will permit me to remind you that her Ma-

43 A C—VOL. I

Her Majesty's government cannot justly plead the inefficacy of the provisions of the enlistment law to enforce the duties of neutrality in the present emergency as depriving them of the power to prevent the anticipated danger. It will doubtless be remembered that the proposition made by you, and which I had the honor of being the medium of conveying to my government, to agree upon some forms of amendment of the respective statutes of the two countries, in order to make them more effective, was entertained by the latter, not from any want of confidence in the ability to enforce the existing statute, but from a desire to co-operate with what then appeared to be the wish of her Majesty's ministers. But, upon my communicating this reply to your lordship, and inviting the discussion of propositions, you then informed me that it had been decided not to proceed any further in this direction, as it was the opinion of the cabinet, sustained by the authority of the lord chancellor, that the law was fully effective in its present shape.

I pray your lordship to accept the assurances of the highest consideration with which I have the honor to be, my lord, your most obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

[Transmitted with Mr. Adams's dispatch to Mr. Seward, No. 504, of October 1, 1863.]

Lord Russell to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

FOREIGN OFFICE, September 25, 1863.

SIR:

There are, however, passages in your letter of the 16th, as well as in some of your former ones, which so plainly and repeatedly imply an intimation of hostile proceeding toward Great Britain on the part of the government of the United States, unless steps are taken by her Majesty's government which the law does not authorize, or unless the law, which you consider as insufficient, is altered, that I deem it incumbent upon me, in behalf of her Majesty's government, frankly to state to you that her Majesty's government will not be induced by any such consideration either to overstep the limits of the law, or to propose to Parliament any new law which they may not, for reasons of their own, think proper to be adopted. They will not shrink from any consequences of such a decision.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[Transmitted with Mr. Adams's dispatch to Mr. Seward, No. 504, of October 1, 1863.]

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

[Extract.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, September 29, 1863.

MY LORD: I have the honor to acknowledge the reception of your note of the 25th instant. I shall take pleasure in transmitting a copy to my government.

I must pray your lordship's pardon, if I confess myself at a loss to perceive what portions of my late correspondence could justify the implications to which you refer. So far from intimating "hostile proceedings toward Great Britain, unless the law, which I consider as insufficient, is altered," the burden of my argument was to urge a reliance upon the law as sufficient, as well from the past experience of the United States, as from the confidence expressed in it by the most eminent authority in the kingdom.

I pray your lordship to accept the assurances of the highest consideration with which I have the honor to be, my lord, your most obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 760.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 14, 1863.

SIR: The European mails have not arrived, and they are not expected to arrive before the closing of my dispatches for the next steamer.

No striking incident has occurred to change the military situation. Judging upon what is officially received, as well as the public information, the armies of the government are holding their advanced positions firmly, and they are beginning to be felt severely by the insurgents.

On the 11th instant Lord Lyons communicated to me information he had just received from his excellency the governor general of Canada, to the effect that there was reason to believe in the existence of a plot, gotten up in that province by emigrant insurgents from the United States, to invade the northern frontier; set at liberty the insurgent prisoners now in confinement at Johnson's Island, on Lake Erie, near Sandusky; burn Buffalo and other cities on the shores of the lakes. It was supposed that these crimes were to be effected by means of the purchase and arming of steamers in the Canadian ports. This information, which was very gratefully acknowledged, borrows a show of authenticity from revealings which have occasionally reached this government. The proper departments promptly adopted measures which, it is believed, are sufficient to defeat the criminal enterprise. After making due explanations to Lord Lyons, I have, by the President's direction, requested Preston King, esq., of Ogdensburg, on the shore of Lake Ontario, to proceed at once to Quebec, to inform the governor general of the preparations which have been made by this government, and to confer freely with him upon the subject, with a view to conform all our proceedings to the treaty regulations existing between the two countries, and to the comity which is due to Great Britain. It seems proper that you should make these proceedings known to Earl Russell, with expressions of the satisfaction with which the President regards what has been so promptly and liberally done by the governor general of Canada and by Lord Lyons.

It is thought here that the occasion is a fitting one for asking Earl Russell to consider the incidents I have related in connection with the occurrences which have taken place within the proper British realm, threatening invasion or aggression directly from the ports of Liverpool and Glasgow. Do not these incidents show the expediency, not to say the necessity, for some amendments of the laws of the two nations, so as

to secure the practice of neutrality in the spirit of comity and friendship? Have we adequate security that hostile expeditions will not yet issue from British ports? If such expeditions should come from domestic British ports, the same condition of national relations will certainly encourage the fitting out of such expeditions in British colonial ports on our frontier and elsewhere. Could we possibly avoid conflicts between the two countries if British shores or provinces should, through any misunderstanding, be suffered to become bases for naval and military operations against the United States?

Moreover, the principles which shall regulate the maritime conduct of neutral states hereafter are quite likely to be settled by the precedents which arise during our present civil war. Great Britain, as we think, must ultimately be as deeply concerned as we are in preserving in the greatest vigor the cordial principle of non-intervention.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 552.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, December 10, 1863.

SIR:

I then alluded, more particularly, to the great danger attending the abuse that might be made of the vicinage of Canada, and suggested the possibility of reciprocating, in some form or other, the legislation adopted by us in 1838, and referred to in your dispatch. His lordship asked to see the printed copy of the law which came with that paper, and at his desire I left it with him.

Some further general conversation took place, after which I took my leave.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 1136.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, October 24, 1864.

SIR: It is my duty to invite, through you, the serious attention of her Majesty's government to the instances, which unfortunately seem to be multiplying, in which the British possessions in our neighborhood, both continental and insular, have been made bases for hostile proceedings of the insurgents against this country. The motives for such proceedings have undoubtedly been, not a conviction that material damage would result directly from the hostile acts of the insurgents, but a hope that a

just sense of national dignity, and self-preservation on our part, might induce us to resent the toleration of the British authorities, and ultimately, perhaps, lead that government to take part with the insurgents as an open and declared enemy of the United States. The insufficiency of the British neutrality act and of the warnings of the Queen's proclamation to arrest the causes of complaint referred to were anticipated early in the existing struggle, and that government was asked to apply a remedy by passing an act more stringent in its character—such as ours of the 10th of March, 1838, which was occasioned by a similar condition of affairs. This request has not been complied with, though its reasonableness and necessity have been shown by subsequent events.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[No. 1042.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, September 7, 1865.

SIR: In connection with my dispatch No. 964, of the 25th of May last, I have now the honor to transmit a copy of a note received from Lord Russell, dated the 30th of August, in reply to mine addressed to him so long ago as the 20th of May. I am now drawing up a form of reply which seems to be called for by the repetition of singular misconceptions in the historical narrative that require prompt rectification; but I shall not be able to get it ready in season for this steamer. As his lordship's note seems to be intended to convey a distinct proposition for the consideration of the President, I send it forward at once.

I am very glad to perceive the conciliatory and friendly tone of his lordship. It was not quite so visible in the early days of my correspondence with him, when his prejudices were fresh. I have never considered him as actuated by unfriendly feelings, but for a considerable period he certainly acted as if he feared to be suspected of good will. It is pleasant to find the pressure has been taken off.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Lord Russell to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

FOREIGN OFFICE, *August 30, 1865.*

SIR:

You say, indeed, that the government of the United States altered the law at the urgent request of the Portuguese minister. But you forget that the law thus altered was the law of 1794, and that the law of 1818, then adopted, was, in fact, so far as it was considered applicable to the circumstances and institutions of this country, the model of our foreign enlistment act of 1819.

Surely, then, it is not enough to say that your government, at the request of Portugal, induced Congress to provide a new and more stringent law for the purpose of preventing depredations, if Great Britain has already such a law. Had the law of the United States of 1818 not been already, in its main provisions, adopted by our legislature, you might reasonably have asked us to make a new law; but, surely, we are not bound to go on making new laws *ad infinitum*, because new occasions arise.

The fact is, this question of a new law was frequently discussed; but the conclusion arrived at was, that unless the existing law, after a sufficient trial, should be proved to be practically inadequate, the object in view would not be promoted by any attempt at new legislation.

The existing law has, in fact, not proved inadequate, when circumstances of strong suspicion have been so far established as to justify the government in ordering the detention of the suspected vessels; and it is by no means certain that any possible alteration of the law would enable more to be done, in the way of prevention, than this. That power was exercised in the case of the rams, in the Mersey, and of the Canton, or Pampero, in the Clyde; and in neither case has the power so exercised been censured or revoked, either in a court of law or by any vote of Parliament.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 1052.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, September 21, 1865.

SIR: I now have the honor to transmit to you a copy of my note to Lord Russell, in reply to his of the 30th of August, which I have already mentioned as in preparation. It is longer than I had intended to make it, but I hope it may serve to close the controversy on this side. I beg to observe that nearly all of the historical portion, which most conduced to prolixity, was of his lordship's making.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Lord Russell.

[Extract.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, September 18, 1865.

MY LORD: I have the honor to receive your note of the 30th of last month in reply to mine of the 20th of May last.

With respect to that portion of your lordship's note which appears to

defend the existing legislation as having really proved adequate, I beg leave only to remark that it is sufficiently answered by the fact that you proceed to specify in proof of it only those cases in which her Majesty's government is admitted to have taken a responsibility of action beyond the law. Whilst I have always been ready to bear testimony to the eminent utility of the action for which your lordship appears to have assumed a grave responsibility, I am at a loss to perceive how this diminishes the force of the reasoning which would seek from the legitimate protection of the law of the land that performance of obligations which appears now to depend only on the courage of the minister to transcend its limits.

And here I must pray permission to dwell a moment upon one passage of your lordship's note which has excited a strong sense of surprise, not to say astonishment. In order that I may by no possibility be guilty of any misconstruction of the meaning of the language, I take the liberty, with your permission, to transfer the very words. They are these:

"You say, indeed, that the government of the United States altered the law at the request of the Portuguese minister.

"But you forget that the law thus altered was the law of 1794, and that the law of 1818, then adopted, was, in fact, so far as it was considered applicable to the circumstances and institutions of this country, the model of our foreign enlistment act of 1819.

"Surely, then, it is not enough to say that your government, at the request of Portugal, induced Congress to provide a new and more stringent law for the purpose of preventing depredations, if Great Britain has already such a law. Had the law of the United States of 1818 not been already, in its main provisions, adopted by our legislature, you might reasonably have asked us to make a new law; but, surely, we are not bound to go on making new laws *ad infinitum* because new occasions arise."

"If I do not rightly comprehend the sense of your lordship, I pray to be corrected, when I assume it to be, that an argument drawn from the precedent of the course of my government in enacting a new law to meet the remonstrance of the Portuguese minister has no force in supporting the representation I make in the present instance, because these very provisions of American legislation have been already long since substantially adopted by Great Britain in the enlistment act, the very act which is now complained of as ineffective. In other words, your lordship appears to take it for granted that Great Britain, having already passed a law as stringent and effective as that of the United States, is, therefore, justified in declining any proposal to go on amending it.

If this be, in verity, your position, I must pray your pardon if I hazard the remark, in reply, that you cannot have given to the respective statutes in question the benefit of that careful collation which the occasion would seem to require. If you had done so, you must have noticed that, in point of fact, they are materially unlike. The British law is, as your lordship states, a re-enactment of that of the United States, but it does not adopt all of "its main provisions," as you seem to suppose. Singularly enough, it entirely omits those very same sections which were originally enacted in 1817, as a temporary law on the complaint of the Portuguese minister, and were made permanent in that of 1818. It is in these very sections that our experience has shown us to reside the best preventive force in the whole law. I do not doubt, as I had the honor to remark in my former note, that if they had been also incor-

porated in the British statute, a large portion of the undertakings of which my government so justly complains would have never been commenced; or, if commenced, would never have been executed. Surely it was not from any fault of the United States that these effective provisions of their own law failed to find a place in the corresponding legislation of Great Britain. But the occasion having arisen when the absence of some similar security was felt by my government to be productive of the most injurious effects, I cannot but think that it was not so unreasonable, as your lordship appears to assume, that I should hope to see a willingness in that of Great Britain to make the reciprocal legislation still more complete. In that hope it was destined to be utterly disappointed. Her Majesty's government decided not to act. Of that decision it is no part of my duty to complain. The responsibility for the injuries done to citizens of the United States by the subjects of a friendly nation, by reason of this refusal to respond, surely cannot be made to rest with them. It appears, therefore, necessarily to attach to the party making the refusal.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, my lord, your most obedient, humble servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[From British Blue Book "North America," No. 1, 1866, p. 163.]

No. 23.

The Earl of Clarendon to Sir F. Bruce.

[Extract.]

FOREIGN OFFICE, December 26, 1865.

SIR: Mr. Adams called upon me by appointment.

A lengthened discussion then ensued as to the manner in which the obligations of neutrality had been performed by this country during the late civil war. It was conducted without acrimony, and was put an end to by myself, as leading to no useful or practical result.

I, however, asked Mr. Adams whether it would not be both useful and practical to let bygones be bygones, to forget the past, and turn the lessons of experience to account for the future. England and the United States, I said, had each become aware of the defects that existed in international law, and I thought it would greatly redound to the honor of the two principal maritime nations of the world to attempt the improvements in that code which had been proved to be necessary. It was possible, I added, that the wounds inflicted by the war were still too recent, and that the ill will towards England was still too rife, to render such an undertaking practicable at the present moment; but it was one which ought to be borne in mind, and that was earnestly desired by her Majesty's government, as a means of promoting peace and abating the horrors of war; and a work, therefore, which would be worthy of the civilization of our age, and which would entitle the governments which achieved it to the gratitude of mankind.

Mr. Adams, in reply, said the law of England, in its international

application, stood greatly in need of amendment; but he gave me no encouragement to expect that his government would co-operate with that of her Majesty in the course of proceeding which I had suggested.

You will, however, avail yourself of such opportunities as you may think fitting to bring the subject under the consideration of Mr. Seward or the President, and you can neither exaggerate the importance attached to it by her Majesty's government or the satisfaction it would give them to co-operate with the government of the United States in a work of which the benefit would be universal.

I am, &c.,

CLARENDON.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 1127.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, January 4, 1866.

SIR: I feel very much honored in receiving the President's approbation of my share of the correspondence with Lord Clarendon. In accordance with your desire, expressed in No. 1626, of the 14th of December, I have disposed of the only remaining proposition left open between us in a note to his lordship, a copy of which I have the honor to transmit.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to the Earl of Clarendon.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, January 3, 1866.

MY LORD: It may, perhaps, be recollected by your lordship that in the note which I had the honor to address to you on the 18th November allusion was made to a suggestion made by your predecessor, the right honorable Earl Russell, in his note of the 2d of the same month, which I was then answering, that looked to the possibility of a concurrent revision of the statutes of both nations to the end that greater security might be given to them against those who endeavor to evade the letter of their present neutrality laws. Considering this in the nature of a proposition, I took the liberty to mention to you that I should with pleasure transmit it for the consideration of my government.

I have now the honor to inform your lordship that the views of that subject expressed in my note have met with approval. It is, then, with regret, but without surprise, that I find myself directed to add that the United States do not incline toward an acceptance of his lordship's proposition.

I pray your lordship to accept, &c., &c., &c.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. the EARL OF CLARENDON, &c., &c., &c.

[From British Blue Book "North America," No. 1, 1866, p. 176.]

No. 27.

The Earl of Clarendon to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE,
January 4, 1866.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 3d instant, in which you inform me that the United States government is not inclined to assent to a concurrent revision of the statutes of the two nations with a view to the more complete execution of the duties of neutrality.

I am, &c.,

CLARENDON.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 1161.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, March 1, 1866.

SIR: At the last moment last week I transmitted to you a copy of the London Times of Saturday last, containing the report of a debate in the House of Commons the night before on two different topics connected with America. I had not time to draw your attention to the singular statement made by Sir Roundell Palmer, touching certain facts of the negotiation carried on between the two governments, which attempted to create an impression that the failure of the British cabinet to improve their preventive laws was entirely owing to the action at Washington. There was a want of ingenuousness in the purely lawyer-like manner in which the case was drawn up, which for the time completely imposed on the least credulous members of the assembly. It seemed to me to be a proceeding which called for some form of remonstrance at once. So I prepared and sent a note to Lord Clarendon, briefly recapitulating the principal steps in the transactions referred to, and clearing the chronology over which some mist had been thrown. It can hardly be presumed that a case can be felt to be very strong which is thought to stand in need of such kind of support. The effort to prove by mere argument the inefficiency of our statute, without any evidence of facts to support it, in the past practice, is quite of a piece with Lord Russell's allegations in the Portuguese question, which I presume to have emanated from the same source.

The truth is, that with the highest respect for Sir Roundell Palmer in private life, I have never been able entirely to acquiesce in his notions of his duty as an officer of the government in a deliberative assembly.

I have the honor to transmit a copy of my note to Lord Clarendon. Since it was sent I perceive I made an omission in not fortifying my own report of my last conference with Lord Russell by the corroborating evidence of his lordship himself, in his note to Lord Lyons of the 14th February, 1863.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to the Earl of Clarendon.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, February 24, 1866.

MY LORD: I have the honor to submit to your lordship's consideration an extract of what purports to be a speech of her Majesty's attorney general, Sir R. Palmer, in the House of Commons last evening, which I find reported in the London Times of this morning:

"The honorable member for Windsor (Mr. Labouchere) is slightly in error when he says that the English government was several times requested to amend the foreign enlistment act; in fact, the very reverse of that statement is nearer to the truth. It should be remembered that at an early period of the American war, the government of this country, foreseeing that very important questions of international law might arise during the progress of the war, suggested to the American government that the foreign enlistment acts of both countries should be revised, and any additions that might be thought necessary made to them. What was the answer made by the American government to this offer of ours? What was the answer of the American government to this offer? Why, to use an humble expression, they threw cold water on it altogether. They said that they had no objection to enter into the consideration of such a question, but, for their own part, they were of opinion that their foreign enlistment act required no amendment and was perfectly adapted for its purposes. I ask the house what position the government would have been placed, in if, after the receipt of such an answer as that, they had asked Parliament to add more stringent provisions to the foreign enlistment act. The first question asked in the house would be whether we had received any intimation from the American government of any intention to make corresponding changes in their foreign enlistment act. Our answer to such a question would have been that we had received a communication on the subject from the United States government, who were of opinion that there was no necessity for making any alteration in their foreign enlistment act. After giving such an answer how could the government expect to have their bill adopted by the house? [Hear.]"

Disclaiming, as a representative of a foreign country, the smallest right to raise questions in regard to any words that may be uttered in the great deliberative assemblies of this kingdom by members in no way sharing a responsibility for the proceedings of her Majesty's government towards foreign nations, I cannot at the same time decline to observe that the confidential relation of the distinguished person who holds the position of chief legal adviser to the Crown, invests any statement which he thinks proper to make in regard to the action of a foreign country with an authority before the world closely akin to that of her Majesty's ministers themselves. It seems, therefore, difficult for me to avoid bringing to your lordship's attention those particulars in the extract above submitted which appear to me not only to be at variance with the actual facts in the transaction therein referred to, but doing more or less of injustice to the position occupied by my government as a party to it.

I understand it to be substantially affirmed in the passage cited—

1st. That the British government spontaneously, of its own volition, initiated early in the war a proposition to the government which I represent to revise the foreign enlistment acts of both countries, and make such additions as might be thought necessary to them.

2d. That the answer of the United States to this offer was like throwing cold water on it altogether. They said they had no objection to enter into the consideration of such a question, but they were satisfied with their own law as it stood. Hence it is clearly implied in the sequel, though not affirmed in words, that, *as a consequence of this answer*, the British government were reluctantly compelled to desist from appealing to Parliament at all.

It is with unaffected regret that I feel absolutely constrained to point out to your lordship the grave errors of fact contained in both these propositions. Inasmuch as the several papers from which I proceed to quote as my authorities have been given to the world in print, long since accessible to all men, it is only necessary for me to refer to them in brief, in order to substantiate my statement.

On the 25th of October, 1862, I received from Mr. Seward, the Secretary of State, a brief letter, inclosing papers connected with the ravages committed by the Alabama. It closed with these words:

"The President directs that you lay copies of the substance of these papers before Earl Russell in such manner as shall seem best calculated to effect two important objects: First, due redress for the national and private injuries sustained; secondly, a prevention of such lawless and injurious proceedings hereafter."

On the 27th of the same month, that is, two days later, he repeated the instructions, using the same terms "redress" and "prevention."

On the 20th of November I addressed a note to the Right Hon. Earl Russell, at the close of which are these words:

"I have the honor to inform your lordship of the directions which I have received from my government to solicit redress for the national and private injuries already thus sustained, as well as a more effective prevention of any such repetition of such lawless and injurious proceedings in her Majesty's ports hereafter."

It was in answer to this demand that the proposition of Earl Russell, to which the attorney general refers in his remarks, was made. In his reply to my note, dated the 19th December, 1862, after declining the first proposition of Mr. Seward for redress for the past, his lordship goes on to speak of the second, which related to prevention for the future. This is the language used:

"As regards your demand for a more effective prevention for the future of the fitting-out of such vessels in British ports, I have the honor to inform you that her Majesty's government, after consultation with the law officers of the Crown, are of opinion that certain amendments might be introduced into the foreign enlistment act, which, if sanctioned by Parliament, would have the effect of giving greater power to the executive to prevent the construction in British ports of ships destined for the use of belligerents. But her Majesty's government consider that before submitting any proposals of that sort to Parliament, it would be desirable that they should previously communicate with the government of the United States, and ascertain whether that government is willing to make similar alterations in its own foreign enlistment act, and that the amendments, like the original statute, should, as it were, proceed *pari passu* in both countries."

Such was the origin of the proposal alluded to by the distinguished attorney general. It must, therefore, be plain to your lordship that it was *not* made early in the war, but only after the ravages committed by the Alabama had roused the attention of my government to the subject. Neither was it initiated spontaneously, but was wholly the offspring of a demand made by my government for more effective measures

of prevention of such ravages committed by vessels fitted out from British ports.

I now proceed to show to your lordship, in like manner, the fallacy in the other proposition of the attorney general.

On the 25th of December, 1862, I wrote to Mr. Seward, transmitting for consideration the proposal made by Earl Russell.

On the 19th of January, 1863, Mr. Seward addressed to me a reply, in which he refers to his lordship's proposal in these words:

"It is not presumed that our anti-enlistment act is defective, or that Great Britain has ground to complain that it has not been effectually executed. Nevertheless, the proposition of her Majesty's government, that the two governments shall confer together upon amendments to the corresponding acts in the two countries, evinces a conciliatory, a liberal, and just spirit, if not a desire to prevent further causes of complaint. You are, therefore, authorized to confer with Earl Russell, and to transmit, for the consideration of the President, such amendments as Earl Russell may in such a conference suggest, and you may think proper to be approved."

I shall abstain from entering into any discussion of whether this language is or is not fairly to be considered as "throwing cold water on it altogether." That is a matter of opinion. At present I shall strive to confine myself strictly to the consideration of facts. The point now is to ascertain, if possible, precisely what effect the communication of it did actually have on the action of her Majesty's government.

On the 7th of February I was favored with an interview by Earl Russell, upon which occasion I communicated to him the substance of the answer. The official report of this interview, which I made to Mr. Seward on the 13th of February, is in the following words:

"In obedience to your instructions, contained in dispatch No. 454, I called the attention of Lord Russell, in my conference of Saturday, to the reply made by him to my note of the 20th of November last, claiming reparation for the damage done by No. 290, and security against any repetition of the same in future. I observed that my government had not yet authorized me to say anything in regard to the answer on the first point; but with respect to the second, his lordship's suggestion of possible amendments to the enlistment laws, in order to make them more effective, had been favorably received; although the law of the United States was considered as of very sufficient vigor, the government were not unwilling to consider propositions to improve upon it.

"To that end I had been directed to ask whether any such had yet been matured by her Majesty's ministers; if so, I should be happy to receive and to transmit them to Washington. His lordship, repeating my remark—that my government considered its present enlistment act as sufficiently effective—then added that, since his note was written, the subject had been considered in the cabinet, and the lord chancellor had expressed the same opinion of the British law. Under these circumstances he did not see that he could have any change to propose."

Thus it appears that the essential fact is developed, that his lordship's answer, declining to proceed any further, was made forthwith, and was the result of cabinet deliberations, previously held, and of the opinion of the lord chancellor thereupon given. It was in no way the effect of the communication made by myself at the moment, but had been prepared in advance to meet it whenever it came, or whatever it might be. It fell in with an opinion expressed by Mr. Seward, but was in no manner dependent upon it.

If this be the correct chronology, it follows that no such hypothetical

difficulty in an appeal to Parliament, after such an answer as is described by her Majesty's attorney general, could ever have been possible. Her Majesty's government had decided, before the answer ever appeared, not to make any such appeal, but rather to abide by the lord chancellor's confidence in the existing statute.

In addressing this note to your lordship, I pray you to understand that I disclaim all intention to impute an evil motive to the distinguished and excellent gentleman against whose language I have been constrained to enter this protest. In the present state of the relations between the two countries, which I cannot disguise to be delicate, I am sensible of the great importance of every word that falls from the lips of persons in authority on either side. Hence, it has been under a painful sense of duty that I have marked to your lordship these errors, doubtless of inadvertence, committed by so eminent an officer of the Crown, which may, nevertheless, excite much comment among my countrymen, and aggravate the resentment for injustice suffered, already, unfortunately, much too prevalent with them.

I pray your lordship to accept, &c., &c., &c.

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. the EARL OF CLARENDON, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 1164.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,

London, March 8, 1866.

SIR: I have to acknowledge the reception of dispatches from the department numbered from 1687 to 1690, inclusive, likewise of 1684, reported as missing last week, and lastly of a bound set of the Diplomatic Correspondence of 1864.

On the evening of the day on which I last wrote, another debate took place in the House of Commons on questions of maritime law, a report of which, in the London Times, I have the honor to transmit. It appears that the attorney general seized the opportunity to make the necessary corrections of his speech the week before. The only point he failed to make quite clear was the alleged effect of the answer of our government in producing the decision of the ministry here not to propose any modification of the enlistment law. The fact that this decision was reached irrespective of and prior to the communication of that answer is made so clear on the very face of the correspondence, that in common candor the truth should have been frankly recognized.

Although the course of this debate gives an appearance of preponderance in sentiment in one direction, it must not be inferred that that indicates the prevalence of that sentiment among the members generally. The truth is, the subject as it now stands is felt to be so full of difficulties that much the greater number decline to commit themselves upon it in any way.

* * * * *

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 1168.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, March 15, 1866.

SIR: In connection with my dispatch No. 1164, of the 8th instant, I now have the honor to transmit copies of two more notes which have passed between Lord Clarendon and myself, on the extraordinary position taken by the attorney general in his speech of the 23d of February, in the House of Commons.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

The Earl of Clarendon to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *March 10, 1866.*

SIR: I lost no time in communicating to her Majesty's attorney general the note which you did me the honor to address to me on the 24th ultimo, with reference to statements on the subject of proposed amendments in the foreign enlistment acts of this country and the United States, reported to have been made by the attorney general in the House of Commons on the previous evening; and I have now the honor to inclose, with the hope that it may be satisfactory to you, a copy of a statement which has been made to me by the attorney general in reply.

I have the honor, &c., &c.,

CLARENDON.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Palmer to the Earl of Clarendon.

LINCOLN'S INN, *March 6, 1866.*

After a careful reconsideration of the expressions used by me on the occasion to which Mr. Adams refers, and of the document cited in his letter to your lordship, I am unable to perceive that there was in the substance of my observations anything which, when rightly understood, can be open to the charge either of misstating material facts, or of placing a wrong construction upon the conduct of the government of the United States. It must be borne in mind that my object was not at all to criticise or reflect upon the conduct of that government, for which I have always entertained a most high and sincere respect, but solely to explain under what circumstances her Majesty's government had determined, during the late war, to put to proof the efficiency or inefficiency of our own foreign enlistment act, without attempting to propose any alteration of it to Parliament.

1. With respect to the exact date at which the overture to which I referred was made by her Majesty's government, my memory (for I spoke from memory) was certainly not quite accurate, and on that point I willingly accept Mr. Adams's correction, but I must be permitted to add, that the circumstance of that overture having been made after and not before the commencement of the discussions with respect to the Alabama, would (if it had been present to my mind) have enabled me to give addi-

tional point to some of my observations as to the manner in which that overture was met by the government of the United States.

2. Mr. Adams appears to think that the facts did not warrant me in representing this overture as having been made by her Majesty's government "spontaneously, of its own volition." The letter of Earl Russell, dated the 19th December, 1862, in which it was contained, having been written in answer to one from Mr. Adams himself, in which (after seeking redress for the captures made by the Alabama) he solicited from her Majesty's government "a more effective prevention of any repetition of such lawless and injurious proceedings in her Majesty's ports." No doubt it was with a view to this latter object, mutually desired by both governments, that Earl Russell, in reply, suggested the consideration of the question whether amendments might not advantageously be made in the foreign enlistment acts of both countries. That suggestion, however, though made upon such an occasion, did not the less originate with her Majesty's government, and was not the less entirely spontaneous on their part. Mr. Adams had on one or two former occasions intimated that new legislation by Great Britain against blockade-running, and against the exportation of munitions of war from this country to the Confederate States, might have been acceptable to the government of the United States; but I am not aware that he had ever, down to that time, suggested any alteration of our foreign enlistment act as necessary for the more efficient prevention of naval equipments for warlike purposes; and the sequel of the correspondence itself clearly proves that the government of the United States did not look upon their own act of Congress of 1818 as requiring any such alteration.

I see no reason, therefore, to recede at all from the substance of that part of my statement in which Mr. Adams understands me to have affirmed "that the British government spontaneously, of its own volition, initiated a proposition to the government of the United States to revise the foreign enlistment acts of both countries, and make such additions as might be thought necessary to them."

3. But with respect to the remaining and more important point, I cannot altogether admit the correctness of Mr. Adams's interpretation of my language. He understands it to have been substantially affirmed by me, "that the answer of the United States to this offer was like throwing cold water on it altogether. They said they had no objection to enter into the consideration of such a question, but they were satisfied with their own law as it stood." So far, Mr. Adams quite fairly represents the effect of my statement, and the documents cited by himself (as well as Earl Russell's dispatch to Lord Lyons on the same subject, to which he does not refer) *prove the fact* to have been as I stated it, whether I rightly described such an answer as cold and discouraging or not. Mr. Adams, indeed, quotes a letter from Mr. Seward to himself, dated the 19th of January, 1863, and says that he "abstains from entering into any discussion of whether the language of that letter is or is not fairly to be considered as 'throwing cold water altogether' on Earl Russell's proposition." But he does not state that the terms of that letter of Mr. Seward were ever communicated to her Majesty's government, nor can I find the least trace of such a communication having been made in any of the sources of information open to me. I do not, therefore, perceive how the language of Mr. Seward in a letter to Mr. Adams can legitimately be called in aid to alter or modify the impression which Mr. Adams's own conversation with Earl Russell may have been in itself calculated to produce.

Mr. Adams proceeds to say that it was "clearly implied in the sequel,"

(of my observations,) "though not affirmed in words, that as a consequence of this answer the British government were reluctantly compelled to desist from appealing to Parliament at all," and then, after citing passages from the documents which passed between himself and the government at Washington, ending with his own dispatch which contains a record of the conversation between himself and Earl Russell, he assumes it to have been shown "that his lordship's answer, declining to proceed any further, was made forthwith, and was the result of cabinet deliberations previously held, and of the opinion of the lord chancellor theretofore given." "It was," he adds, "in no way the effect of the communication made by myself at the moment, but had been prepared in advance to meet it whenever it came, or whatever it might be. It fell in with an opinion expressed by Mr. Seward, but was in no manner dependent upon it. If this be the correct chronology it follows that no such hypothetical difficulty in an appeal to Parliament, after such an answer as is described by her Majesty's attorney general, could ever have been possible. Her Majesty's government had decided before the answer ever appeared not to make any such appeal, but rather to abide by the lord chancellor's confidence in the existing statute."

I cannot think it was a just inference from anything which I said that her Majesty's government were "reluctantly compelled" to desist from making any application to Parliament as a consequence of Mr. Adams's answer to Earl Russell's suggestion. I neither said nor implied that her Majesty's government were *desirous* of making any such application to Parliament, much less that the answer returned by the United States government to Earl Russell's overture was their only or their principal reason for not making it. On the contrary, the manifest difficulty of carrying such a measure through Parliament at such a time, and the great inconvenience of any unsuccessful attempt to do so, (to which I did not omit to refer,) would necessarily make the conclusion that such an attempt was unnecessary (if it could be arrived at on good grounds) acceptable to her Majesty's government, and the opinion formed in the cabinet under the advice of the lord chancellor, (which I also mentioned in the debate,) that our existing law would probably be found upon trial sufficient for its purpose, must (of course) have contributed in a very important degree to that conclusion. But as I read the reports of this conversation, (both that made by Mr. Adams and that of Earl Russell to Lord Lyons,) I find nothing in either of them to justify Mr. Adams's inference that her Majesty's government had determined beforehand to let the matter drop, at all events, and not to propose any measure to Parliament, whatever the answer of the government of the United States might be. Lord Russell did, indeed, at once come to the conclusion, which he then announced to Mr. Adams, that the matter could not, at that time, usefully be carried further. But why? Not because the cabinet had already so decided, but because the opinion of the government of the United States, as expressed by Mr. Adams, as to their own law, was found to coincide with the opinion of the lord chancellor expressed in the cabinet as to our law. Under these circumstances there appeared to be an agreement of opinion between the governments of both countries, that reliance might safely be placed upon their existing laws; and if any measure had been afterward proposed to Parliament, the opinions thus formed and expressed must (when made known) have had an unfavorable influence upon its chance of success. To prosecute the negotiation further, under such circumstances, might not improbably have proved a source of serious embarrassment to her Majesty's government, unless some amendments to the laws of both countries had actu-

ally resulted from it; and the prospect of such a result was too uncertain to justify the risk. The government of the United States had thought it necessary, while expressing their willingness to consider any propositions which might emanate from her Majesty's government, to guard themselves against being supposed to admit that their own law (in the language of Mr. Adams) was not "of very sufficient vigor," or (in the language of Earl Russell) that it "could be improved." They were willing to receive suggestions; but, though invited to do so, they themselves made none. What might have been the effect of this if her Majesty's government had been satisfied that an amendment of our foreign enlistment act was indispensable for the accomplishment of its objects, I cannot pretend to say, but under the actual circumstances of the case, its natural (not to say necessary) effect was the reply immediately given by Earl Russell to Mr. Adams; in which reply the government of the United States, without any appearance of surprise or dissatisfaction, acquiesced.

Mr. Adams thinks himself warranted in concluding that if the answer of the government of the United States had been different, the reply of Earl Russell would still have been the same. My conclusion, from the facts and the documents, was and is the reverse. Having voluntarily proposed to enter into communication, with a view to the mutual revision of the statutes of both countries, on a very important and very practical subject, it was fully open to his lordship to withdraw from that proposal, when the government of the United States had expressed their willingness to entertain it in a merely passive sense, without accepting any part of the responsibility of pressing it forward, or even encouraging it so far as to say that they concurred in the views with which it had been originally proposed, or that they anticipated any prospect of advantage from its further prosecution. Under these circumstances the lord chancellor's opinion that there was no practical necessity for a change in our law became decisive. But my belief is, that the cabinet had, in fact, come to no conclusion which would have superseded the further consideration of the question at that time if the United States government had stated it to be the result of their experience, that their own law required amendments to make it perfectly efficient—much less if they had expressed an anxiety to agree in such amendments as might make the laws of both countries more effective for their common purpose, and had offered or stated themselves to be prepared to offer any practical suggestions with that view. Nor does it appear to me at all probable that if such had been the tenor of the answer given by Mr. Adams to Earl Russell's proposal, his lordship would nevertheless have broken off a negotiation initiated by himself, merely because the lord chancellor had in the mean time induced the cabinet to take a more favorable view than that which had been entertained by her Majesty's law officer of our existing law.

I think, therefore, I did not err in my appreciation of the substance of what took place between the two governments; and although I do not attribute, and never have attributed, the decision of her Majesty's government solely to the opinion expressed by the government of the United States as to the sufficiency of their own law, I still continue to believe (what alone I meant to state or imply in my place in Parliament) that the opinion so expressed by the government of the United States did exercise a material influence upon the course then and subsequently taken by her Majesty's government, and that it would have been also likely to prove a serious impediment to the success of any measure for the amendment of the foreign enlistment act, if such a measure (even

after some continued negotiation with the government of the United States) had been introduced into Parliament.

I have, &c., &c.,

ROUNDELL PALMER.

The EARL OF CLARENDON.

P. S.—I annex, as necessary to give a complete view of what passed, the two following extracts: No. 1 being the passage in Earl Russell's letter to Mr. Adams, of December 19, 1862, immediately following that quoted by Mr. Adams; and the other, No. 2, being Earl Russell's report to Lord Lyons, dated February 14, 1863, of his conversation with Mr. Adams:

No. 1.

"I shall accordingly be ready to confer at any time with you, and to listen to any suggestion which you may have to make, by which the British foreign enlistment act and the corresponding statute of the United States may be made more efficient for their purpose."

No. 2.

"Mr. Adams said that his government was ready to listen to any propositions her Majesty's government had to make; but they did not see how their own law on this subject could be improved." I said, "that the cabinet had come to a similar conclusion, so that no further proceedings need be taken at present on this subject."

R. P.

Mr. Adams to the Earl of Clarendon.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, March 12, 1866.

MY LORD: I have the honor to acknowledge the reception of your note of the 10th instant, and of a copy of a statement made to your lordship by the attorney general, in reply to the remonstrance which I felt it my duty to address to you on the 24th ultimo, against what appeared to me to be errors affecting the position of my government, in his speech in the House of Commons the previous evening.

I have read that statement with the attention which is due not less to the distinguished position of that eminent individual, than to my own personal respect for his high character. If I have unfortunately failed in entirely mastering the purport of his reasoning, it may, perhaps, be owing to my own inability to understand the necessity for any at all.

The question which it was my intention to propound was not one touching any class of opinions, but simply naked facts. I pray your lordship's pardon if I briefly recapitulate the conflicting statements.

I understood the attorney general substantially to affirm—

1. That her Majesty's government had voluntarily initiated a proposition to the government which I have the honor to represent, to amend and improve the provisions of the British enlistment law, for the benefit of the United States.

2. That her Majesty's government had been deterred from prosecuting this friendly purpose entirely by the cold and repulsive manner in which that proposition had been met by the United States.

The necessary inference from these propositions, if well founded in the facts, is, that the whole responsibility for any failure of her Majesty's government in securing from Parliament greater safeguards against the abuse of neutrality in this kingdom devolves on the United States.

On behalf of my government, I have only respectfully to repeat my counter-statement, to the following effect:

1. That her Majesty's government, so far as any knowledge of their proceedings was communicated to me, never initiated any proposition to the United States to improve the legislation against abuses of neutrality in this kingdom.

2. That the only thing done was a suggestion of an intention to make such a proposal, and that was elicited by a demand of the United States that something or other should be done. But even this was made conditional upon their consent to reciprocate whatever might be subsequently proposed by the British, and concurred in by the United States government.

3. That that intention was definitely abandoned before any reply from the United States came to the knowledge of her Majesty's government.

So far as the statement made by her Majesty's attorney general may be construed to corroborate the preceding averment of facts, I take great pleasure in expressing my satisfaction with it. So far as it may fall short of admitting them, I must submit that the way to prove the truth and to convict me of error is still open, not through reasoning so much as by an appeal to living testimony. I shall be prepared at all times, very cheerfully, to correct any misapprehension I may have myself fallen into of these facts, so far as they may involve the course of other parties, provided it shall be made plain to me from the proper authority.

Meanwhile, I must take the liberty to insist that my government must be considered as wholly free from every shadow of responsibility for the decision of her Majesty's government to abide by the existing legislation as a sufficient prevention of all abuses of the neutrality of the realm.

I pray your lordship to accept, &c., &c.

CHARLES FRANCOIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. the EARL OF CLARENDON, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 1712.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, March 20, 1866.

SIR: I have received your dispatch of the 1st instant, No. 1161, and its accompaniments. It informs me of the proceeding which you adopted to remove any erroneous impression which might arise from the statement made by Sir Roundell Palmer in the House of Commons in regard to the disposition of the United States to accede to a proposition for the revival of their foreign enlistment act. It may be satisfactory to you to know that you have performed promptly and with ability an important duty in correcting the misstatement of the attorney general, and it is hardly necessary for me to add further remark in approval of your thoughtfulness in the matter.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCOIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Moran to Mr. Seward.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, March 29, 1866.

SIR: Mr. Adams, who is out of town for a few days, directs me to transmit to you the accompanying copy of a note from Lord Clarendon to him, of the 24th instant, together with a copy of its inclosure of the 21st, from Sir Roundell Palmer to his lordship, relative to the statements made by him lately in the House of Commons, with reference to the question of amending the foreign enlistment acts of Great Britain and the United States.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
BENJ. MORAN,
Secretary of Legation.

HON. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

The Earl of Clarendon to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, March 24, 1866.

SIR: I forwarded to the attorney general your further letter of the 12th instant, relative to the statements made by that gentleman in the House of Commons with reference to the question of amending the foreign enlistment acts of this country and the United States, and I have now the honor to transmit you a copy of a further statement which the attorney general has made to me by way of rejoinder to your letter.

I have the honor, &c., &c., &c.,

CLARENDON.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Extract from her Majesty's attorney general's report, dated March 21, 1866.

Mr. Adams's letter of the 12th instant calls for little further observation on my part.

If Mr. Adams understood me "substantially to affirm" the two propositions embodied in this letter, all I can say is that he misunderstood me. I stated (as is the truth) that her Majesty's government "voluntarily initiated a proposition" to the United States government not "to amend the provisions of the British foreign enlistment law for the benefit of the United States," but that the foreign enlistment act of both countries should be revised with a view to their simultaneous amendment, if, *after* mutual communication, such amendments should appear to the two governments to be practicable and desirable.

I further stated the answer, which was, in fact, given by the United States government to that overture, describing it (and, I think, truly,) as one which did not encourage her Majesty's government to proceed further in the matter, and as one which, if the matter had been carried further, might have been used in Parliament as an argument against the existence of any necessity for the alteration of our law. But I did not, either directly or "substantially," affirm that "her Majesty's government had been deterred from prosecuting this friendly proposal

entirely by the cold and repulsive manner in which that proposition had been met by the United States."

I disclaim wholly the inference which Mr. Adams considers to follow from the propositions which he attributes to me, namely, that "the whole responsibility for any failure of her Majesty's government in securing from Parliament greater safeguards against the abuse of neutrality in this kingdom devolves on the United States." Nothing could possibly be further from my mind than the idea that the United States ought to be held responsible for the decision of her Majesty's government to abide by and enforce the existing law of this country. It is one thing to attribute (as I think I was fully justified in attributing) considerable practical importance to the opinion expressed by the government of the United States at that juncture, that their own law was "very sufficient" for its intended purpose, and another thing to say or imply that because such was the opinion of the United States her Majesty's government were not solely and exclusively responsible for forming and acting upon a similar opinion as to the law of this country.

The only other statements in Mr. Adams's letter which seem to me to require any remark are those in which he insists that the only thing done by her Majesty's government was "*a suggestion of an intention to make a proposal*," and that "*that intention was definitively abandoned* before any reply from the United States came to the knowledge of her Majesty's government."

I am surprised that Mr. Adams, who speaks so much in this letter of facts, (as opposed to reasoning,) should again have overlooked the fact (proved by the passage of Earl Russell's letter of the 19th December, 1862,) which was extracted in the appendix to my former remarks that her Majesty's government did not merely "suggest an intention to make a proposal," but expressly invited suggestions from the government of the United States, which they failed to obtain. Upon the other question, whether the intention conveyed by Earl Russell had been "definitively abandoned" before the answer of the United States government was received, Mr. Adams (unless he has some private information not discoverable from the contemporaneous documents, and which has never been communicated to me) seems simply to confound two things materially different, viz :

First. An opinion arrived at by the cabinet, under the advice of the lord chancellor, that reliance might be placed on the sufficiency of our foreign enlistment act for its intended purpose; and

Second. A definitive resolution not to follow up the overture contained in Earl Russell's letter of the 19th December, 1862. I do not find in the documents to which I have access that any such resolution had been taken in or out of the cabinet, before Earl Russell learned from Mr. Adams that the United States government did not consider their own foreign enlistment act to require, or, indeed, to be susceptible of any improvement.

Mr. Moran to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 8.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, October 13, 1866.

* * * * *

SIR: For some days past there has been a good deal of talk in club

circles about the inefficiency of the foreign enlistment act, and the necessity for amending it. I transmit an article from the Standard of the 10th instant on this subject, which is not without significance. That newspaper is identified with the tory party, and although I cannot say that it is the recognized organ of any member of the present ministry, its known political bias and influence would seem to warrant the belief that it has authority for the announcement that Lord Derby is determined to appoint a royal commission to inquire into the workings of the existing law. The spirit of the article exhibits a feeling of assumed respect for the United States no one who read the Standard during our great struggle would be disposed to suspect it of entertaining.

If such a commission has been determined upon, it is not unfair to conclude that its conception is to be traced to the recent renewal of the President's desire that the two governments should arrive at an early and satisfactory settlement of the claims arising out of the piracy of the Anglo-rebel cruisers.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

BENJAMIN MORAN.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Moran to Mr. Seward.

No. 42.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, June 3, 1868.

SIR: Several of the London newspapers of last Monday contained the substance of the report of the royal commissioners appointed in January, 1867, to inquire into the character and working of what is known here as the foreign enlistment act; and yesterday the report itself, and its accompanying papers, appeared in the form of a blue book. I have the honor to transmit four copies herewith, as well as copies of several of the most influential London journals, with remarks upon the amendments proposed by the commissioners. That some of these will be adopted by Parliament when the act comes up for alteration is tolerably certain. Mr. Vernon Harcourt, as you will perceive, dissents from certain of the recommendations of his fellow commissioners and gives his reasons in a rather lengthy paper.

The memorandum by Mr. Abbott, of the Foreign Office, on the neutrality laws of the United States, goes somewhat into detail, but I have not yet had time to give it a careful examination or to form an opinion of its merits.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

BENJAMIN MORAN.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

[For Report of the Neutrality Law Commissioners see "General Appendix," No. 6.]

SUPPLIES, ETC., OF VESSELS.

Mr. Whiting to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 42.]

UNITED STATES CONSULATE,
At Nassau, N. P., December 10, 1861.

SIR: I have already, through different channels, apprised you of the arrivals of the steamers Isabel and Gladiator, the last from London with arms for the rebels.

* * * * *

The coal which is being landed here for the government has caused great excitement among the Nassau masses, and a deputation visited Governor Nesbitt yesterday to remonstrate against its being landed. They were referred to the attorney general, who showed them that it could not be legally prevented. They do not know that the coal is government stores, though they take that for granted, and the most ultra ones swear that it cannot be reshipped on board a national vessel without violating their "NEUTRALITY" laws. This is barefaced, when there are three rebel steamers now in front of the consulate with secession rags flying, and a British steamer with "contraband of war" on board.

I have the honor to be, &c.,

SAM'L WHITING, *Consul.*

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Whiting to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 43.]

UNITED STATES CONSULATE,
At Nassau, N. P., December 10, 1861.

SIR: I have the honor to inclose to you a copy of the letter sent to me this morning by the colonial secretary, acting on the orders of Lieutenant Governor Nesbitt, in relation to the landing of the cargoes of coal consigned to me by the United States navy agent at Philadelphia.

The vessels were at the consulate dock, and were just on the point of discharging, when I received the governor's letter, and I at once stopped the landing of the coal to await the arrival of the steamer, when I hope to have advices in relation to it. The demurrage will be heavy, to be sure—twenty dollars per diem—but if the coal is kept afloat one of our steamers could be supplied at once should she arrive.

One thing is patent, viz: The government of the United States need expect no favor from the colonial government of the Bahamas, while every facility and encouragement is extended to the rebels who are seeking its overthrow.

* * * * *

I have the honor, &c.,

SAM'L WHITING,
United States Consul.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

BAHAMAS.

COLONIAL SECRETARY'S OFFICE,
Nassau, December 10, 1861.

SIR: The receiver general and treasurer having on the 7th instant forwarded to the lieutenant governor the manifest of cargo on board the United States schooner Caleb Stetson, by which it appears that such cargo consists of three hundred tons of coal, which was shipped from the port of Philadelphia by order of the United States Navy Department, and consigned to yourself as the United States consul at this port, I am directed by the lieutenant governor to inform you that although he has given directions to the receiver general and treasurer to admit the coal to an entry and landing, yet it is on the express condition and understanding that such coal shall not afterward be reshipped or otherwise used in any manner which may, in the opinion of the law authorities of the colony, involve a breach of her Majesty's proclamation of the 13th of May last, and particularly that such coal shall not be used for the purpose of coaling, or affording facilities for coaling, at this port, the vessels of war of the United States navy during the continuance of the hostilities now unhappily existing in America, as his excellency is advised that such would constitute a breach of her Majesty's proclamation before referred to, (a copy of which is inclosed,) the provisions of which it is his excellency's intention to preserve inviolate, unless specially authorized by her Majesty to depart therefrom.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
A. J. THOMPSON,
Acting Colonial Secretary.

Mr. Whiting to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 44.]

UNITED STATES CONSULATE,
At Nassau, N. P., December 12, 1861.

SIR: * * * * * *

I have this day sent to the governor the certificate of the schooner Caleb Stetson's master, stating that his vessel is in a leaky condition, and that it is necessary for the safety of his ship and cargo that part of his coals should be landed at once.

I therefore requested his excellency's permission to discharge on board the United States steamer Flambeau sufficient coal to lighten the Caleb Stetson, citing several authorities as proof that "coal is not contraband."

I inclose a copy of his excellency's reply, objecting to the transhipment, but allowing me to land coals on the condition before named.

As this would place it out of my power to reship them for the use of any United States war vessel, I have ordered the coal schooners to go off to anchor until I receive advices from the department.

I have the honor to be, &c.,

SAMUEL WHITING, *Consul.*

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Thompson to Mr. Whiting.

BAHAMAS.

COLONIAL SECRETARY'S OFFICE,
Nassau, December 12, 1861.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of this date, stating that the master of the schooner Caleb Stetson, of Philadelphia, now lying in this port of Nassau, has this day testified before you that his vessel was leaking so badly that it is necessary that she be at once discharged or lightened, and requesting permission to land the coal on board the United States steamer Flambeau as soon as possible.

In reply, I am directed by the lieutenant governor to state that his excellency is of opinion that it would be *objectionable*, and in violation of the decision already arrived at and communicated to you, to permit the coals on board the Caleb Stetson to be transhipped to the United States steamer Flambeau, but as consignee you have a right to enter the coals and land them.

I have the honor to be, &c.,

A. J. THOMPSON,
Colonial Secretary.

SAMUEL WHITING,
United States Consul.

Mr. Whiting to Mr. Seward.

No. 46.]

UNITED STATES CONSULATE,
Nassau, N. P., December 19, 1861.

SIR: I have the honor to inform you that on the 13th day of December, after having been refused permission to put coals on board the United States steamer Flambeau from an American schooner, the Caleb Stetson, I noticed that the privateer or secession vessel, the Theodora, Mason and Slidell's packet, was being coaled by Hy. Adderley, of this place.

I sent a remonstrance to the governor, and have the honor to inclose his reply.

Very respectfully, &c., &c.,

SAMUEL WHITING, Consul.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Thompson to Mr. Whiting.

BAHAMAS.

COLONIAL SECRETARY'S OFFICE,
Nassau, December 14, 1861.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of yesterday's date, which I submitted to the lieutenant-governor, who, in reply, desires me to inform you that he finds, on reference to the official correspondence on the subject of the coal recently brought to this port from Philadelphia, that the cases referred to are altogether dissimilar.

The Theodora is a merchant vessel lawfully trading to this port, and being propelled by steam it is necessary, to enable her to pursue her occupation as a trader, that she should be supplied with coal. The furnishing this necessary article, therefore, for her use, by a merchant in the way of trade, is perfectly lawful, and cannot be construed into a breach of neutrality.

It is true that in your letter you style the vessel "a privateer," but as far as she is known to the authorities here she is a merchant vessel, and you yourself make use of the alternative, "the privateer or secession vessel."

The Flambeau is, on the other hand, avowedly an armed vessel in the service of the federal government. She has entered this port without apparent necessity for so doing, and the authorities have not been informed of the object of her visit. She has already been in port several days, and the only object which it is reasonable to suppose that her commander has in view is to watch and endeavor to intercept and capture *confederate vessels* trading to this port.

If so, this is making an undue and improper use of a neutral port, and to supply her with coal would be to facilitate her *belligerent operations*.

So far as the Flambeau is concerned, *coal must be considered as contraband of war*, and consequently an article which, under *her Majesty's proclamation*, cannot properly be supplied to her in this port.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

A. J. THOMPSON,
Acting Colonial Secretary.

SAMUEL WHITING,
United States Consul, Nassau.

Mr. Whiting to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 1.]

UNITED STATES CONSULATE,
At Nassau, N. P., January 2, 1862.

SIR:

The colonial governor, Nesbitt, having informed me that "no United States war vessel could be supplied with coal here," I have ordered all the coal fleet to Key West, Florida, except the British brig *Ocile*, whose master, Boggs, refused to go. I have written to the Navy Department full details of the matter, and sent copies of the correspondence between the colonial secretary and myself to the State Department.

The rebel steamer *Isabel*, now British steamer *Ella Warley*, left this port on the 30th ultimo, having taken on board part of the cargo of the British ship *Eliza Bonsall*, consisting of woolen clothes and provisions. I believe no arms were transhipped, or other munitions of war.

The British steamer *Gladiator* is still here, no movement toward discharging having yet taken place.

I have the honor to be, &c., &c.,

SAMUEL WHITING, *Consul.*

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 172.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 31, 1862.

SIR: I learn from reports received at the Navy Department from the commander of the American steamer *Flambeau*, that although the United States have a deposit of coal at Nassau, our steamers are denied the right of taking it for use by the colonial authorities at that place.

I do not send you a formal statement of the fact, because although it is presumed that those authorities have not acted under instructions from London, yet that they nevertheless must themselves have reported their proceedings to the home government. Justified, as I think, by this circumstance, in assuming that the fact which I thus bring to your attention is already known to Earl Russell, I have to request you to ask from him an explanation of the proceeding, and to inquire whether we are to understand that the colonial ports are to be closed against our vessels of war when entering them for coal, and are to be denied even the right of supplying themselves from stores of our own lying in such ports. Liberal as we are in all our intercourse with the British government in American waters, the President declines to believe that that government has sanctioned or will sanction the proceedings of the authorities at Nassau. Should you find this to be the fact, you will suggest to Earl Russell our desire that proper instructions may be given to the authorities there.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 125.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, March 6, 1862.

SIR: * * * * *

I transmit herewith the copy of a note addressed by me to Lord Russell, in conformity with the directions contained in your dispatch No. 172, of the 31st of January, touching the action of the authorities of Nassau. As yet I have received only the customary formal answer from his lordship announcing a reference for information.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, February 24, 1862.

MY LORD: It is with much regret that I find myself under the necessity of troubling your lordship with another application for information

respecting certain alleged acts of the colonial authorities of Nassau unfriendly to the United States.

It has been reported to the Navy Department, from the commander of the United States steamer *Flambeau*, that, although a deposit of coal belonging to that government exists at the place named, its steamers have been interdicted the use of it.

Liberal as is the disposition of the government of the United States in its intercourse with all foreign nations in American waters, the President declines to believe that her Majesty's government have sanctioned or will sanction these proceedings on the part of the authorities of Nassau. Should he prove to have been correct in this opinion, I am directed to solicit of your lordship such action in the proper quarter as may lead to the rectification of the error.

I pray your lordship to accept the assurances of the highest consideration with which I have the honor to be, my lord, your most obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Lord Lyons.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 4, 1863.

MY LORD: I have the honor to inform you that an armed schooner under the insurgent flag, bearing the name of *Retribution*, and commanded by a man named Lock, said to be a native of Yarmouth, Nova Scotia, has recently captured many United States vessels in the waters of the West Indies. Among her victims was the schooner *Hanover*, of Boston. This department has reliable information that the *Hanover*, in charge of a prize crew, was taken to Long Cay, (Fortune Island,) Bahamas, where her cargo was sold without any previous judicial process, the vessel loaded with salt and dispatched to an insurgent port, for the purpose of running the blockade. It is also represented that the magistrates and other officers at Long Cay knew that the *Hanover* had been captured by the *Retribution*.

I have the honor to request that the attention of the proper British authorities be invited to this subject in order that if, upon investigation, the facts should appear to be as above represented, the reparation which this government would have a right to expect may be granted.

I have the honor to be, with high consideration, your lordship's obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

Right Hon. LORD LYONS, &c., &c., &c.

Lord Lyons to Mr. Seward.

WASHINGTON, April 7, 1863.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your note of the 4th instant, stating that you have been informed that the American schooner *Hanover*, of Boston, has been carried as a prize to Long Cay, Bahamas, and that her cargo has been sold there.

I will, without loss of time, send copies of your note to her Majesty's government, and to the governor of the Bahama Islands.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient humble servant,

LYONS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD, &c., &c., &c.

Lord Lyons to Mr. Seward.

WASHINGTON, June 13, 1863.

SIR: With reference to your note of the 4th April last, and to my answer, dated the 7th of the same month, I have the honor to transmit to you copies of a dispatch from the governor of the Bahama Islands, and its inclosure, respecting the circumstances under which the ship Hanover, of Boston, visited Long Cay.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

LYONS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD, &c., &c., &c.

Governor Bayley to Lord Lyons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
Nassau, Bahamas, June 6, 1863.

MY LORD: In reply to your lordship's dispatch of April 30, I transmit a report received from Mr. John Burnside, resident magistrate of Inagua, (which I am obliged to transmit in original, because I have no time to have it copied, and should feel obliged to your lordship to have it returned,) respecting the circumstances under which the Hanover appeared at Long (not Levy) Cay.

Whatever her character, or whoever the ostensible master may have been, I am convinced that no suspicions of either were entertained by any officials of this government until it was too late to act on them.

I have directed further inquiries to be made.

I have, &c.,

C. BAYLEY, Governor.

LORD LYONS, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Burnside to the Hon. Mr. Nesbitt.

MATHEWTOWN, Inagua, April 20, 1863.

SIR: This morning I received your letter of the 18th of March, covering Mr. Jackson's letter to his excellency the governor, relative to the Hanover.

As I happened to be at Long Cay while the Hanover was there, I may, by stating what came under my own observation, furnish such information as is required, without waiting for the inquiry which his excellency directs me to institute on my next visit to that island, which will be in the month of July.

I left Long Cay to go the rounds of my district a few days previous to

the arrival of the Hanover. On my return to Long Cay, the Hanover was at anchor on the south side of the island, and her cargo was being transferred to the schooner Brothers, owned by the Messrs. Farrington. I made inquiries regarding her, and I received the following information, which was the current report of the town, and in fact the person representing himself as the captain of the Hanover confirmed it. He told me that his vessel had been on shore at Little Inagua; that he had succeeded in getting her off without the assistance of the wreckers, but finding that she leaked badly, he determined to take her to Mathewtown; that there he met this schooner Brothers, which vessel he knew to have been commanded by a friend and countryman, one Poithiers; that he immediately sent for Captain Poithiers, but that another person, representing himself as the captain, came and informed him of the death of Captain Poithiers. The then captain informed him that the Brothers was still owned by the Messrs. Farrington, of whom he had heard Captain Poithiers speak highly, and that they were still at Long Cay. This determined him to proceed to Long Cay. But fearing that he might require assistance on the way, he asked the Brothers to accompany him, and that after arriving at Long Cay he consigned to Mr. Richard Farrington. He reported to me that he was bound from Boston to a port on Cuba, or to seek a market, and with the proceeds of the sale of the cargo he was instructed to purchase a cargo of salt and run the blockade; that finding that the Hanover was not injured, he had determined to dispose of as much of his cargo at Long Cay as would purchase a cargo and pay expenses, and that the balance he intended to ship to Nassau in the Brothers. I expressed surprise that a Boston firm would engage in an illicit trade with the South, and he replied that there were many southerners at heart in Boston.

I had my doubts as to the vessel having been on shore at Inagua, and I mentioned my doubts to Mr. Farrington. I told him that I was under the impression that in the cargo there might be articles contraband of war, and that the reported disaster was but a ruse to prevent the Boston merchant being tracked in Nassau in his illicit trade with the South; but I found out afterwards, on inquiry from the acting tidewaiter, that the cargo was really one of provisions.

Mr. Farrington admitted that he also doubted whether the Hanover had been on shore, but inasmuch as the captain came to him properly documented, he did not see any impropriety in his acting as the captain's agent, and that he was not aware of any illegality in the matter. And I must here add that I am under the impression that up to that moment Mr. Farrington was as ignorant of the real facts of the case as I was. It must be remembered that the captain was a perfect stranger; that the register and articles of the Hanover were produced, I believe, at the collector's office, but I know that he had the ship's clearance, the bills of lading, and even the certificate from the custom-house in Boston that the captain had taken the oath of fidelity to the Union. He represented himself as Captain Case, and signed all documents as Washington Case, the name of the captain, as appearing on the documents. As soon as the Brothers was loaded, this person left in her for Nassau, but I have been since informed that he only went as far as Rum Cay, where he was taken off by the Retribution.

The Hanover remained a day or two, after the Brothers had left, at Long Cay, under the charge of the former mate, taking in a cargo of salt; and it was only about half an hour previous to her departure that I—and I am under the impression Mr. Farrington also—had the slightest misgiving that the person who had represented himself as the captain of the Hanover was not Washington Case. One of the sailors of the Han-

over, under the influence of liquor, referred to the supposed captain in the collector's presence by some other name. I was with Mr. Farrington when the collector mentioned the circumstance; reference was immediately made to the document, and the difference in the signatures confirmed what the collector had heard. The supposed Captain Oase had then left in the Brothers, and no action could have been taken, even if I had been armed with power; but even then we were under the impression that the name had been assumed in the custom-house in Boston by some other person to facilitate Captain Oase's leaving Boston, supposing him to have been a suspicious person; and it was only after I left Long Cay, on my way to Inagua, that we met a vessel from Inagua, and I received a letter from Mr. Sargent informing me that he was under the impression that the Hanover was a prize to the Retribution.

These are the facts of the case, so far as came to my knowledge.

Since I have been made aware that the Hanover was a captured vessel, I have wondered why the real Captain Oase had allowed the whole of the papers of his vessel to fall into the captor's hands, particularly his certificate of allegiance. That surely might have been removed from the ship's papers, if not destroyed.

I have also been informed, and I believe correctly, that the cargo of the Hanover was found to be not such as was manifested in the bills of lading. For instance, barrels said to contain pork contained fish. Messrs. G. Regnourds & Co. purchased the cargo, and may, if necessary, be enabled to state whether such was the case. I have also been informed that the Hanover was insured against war risks.

I have heard from Long Cay that the Retribution, subsequent to the affair of the Hanover, captured an American brig in the neighborhood of Castle Island, the Emily Fisher, with a cargo of sugar; that the commander of the Retribution ordered her to be run on shore near Long Cay; and that subsequently she was extricated from danger by the wreckers, who carried her to Long Cay, where salvage was awarded to the wreckers, and a portion of the cargo sold to pay the salvage and expenses; and the Emily Fisher then proceeded with the balance of her cargo to New York.

On the latter occasion the Retribution did call at Long Cay, and some of her officers had communication with Mr. Richard Farrington, and at that time the supposed Washington Oase was seen on board of the Retribution, but I do not know in what capacity.

This is all the information I can give, and I desire to be informed whether I shall make further inquiries when I visit Long Cay.

I have, &c., &c.,

T. B. BURNSIDE.

Hon. C. R. NESBITT.

P. S.—I return Mr. Jackson's letter.

Mr. Seward to Lord Lyons.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 17, 1863.

MY LORD: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your note of the 13th instant, and inclosure, relative to the case of the Hanover.

I have the honor to be, with high consideration, my lord, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

Right Hon. LORD LYONS, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Lord Lyons.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 24, 1863.

MY LORD: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your note of the 13th instant, accompanied by a letter to you from Governor Bayley, at Nassau, and by a report to him, by Mr. T. B. Burnside, relative to the case of the schooner Hanover, of Boston, captured by the insurgent privateer Retribution, and taken to Long Cay, one of the Bahamas.

The information thus communicated is acceptable so far as it goes, but is not deemed altogether conclusive. There still remains a painful doubt in the mind of this government whether the authorities and others at Long Cay were, as Mr. Burnside thinks, ignorant that the Hanover was a prize to the Retribution.

I shall be happy if the inquiry shall be prosecuted so far as may be necessary to show that the undoubtedly just intentions of her Majesty's government have been strictly observed.

I have the honor to be your very obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

Right Hon. LORD LYONS, &c., &c., &c.

Lord Lyons to Mr. Seward.

WASHINGTON, June 30, 1863.

SIR: I had yesterday the honor to receive your note of the 24th instant, requesting that further inquiry might be made respecting the case of the Hanover. I will lose no time in communicating this request to her Majesty's government and to the governor of the Bahamas Islands.

I have the honor to be, with the highest respect, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

LYONS.

Hon. WILLIAM A. SEWARD, &c., &c., &c.

Lord Lyons to Mr. Seward.

WASHINGTON, November 2, 1863.

SIR: With reference to your notes of the 4th April and 17th and 24th June last, and to my note of the 7th April and 13th and 30th June last, I have the honor to transmit to you a copy of a dispatch from the governor of the Bahamas Islands to her Majesty's secretary of state for the colonial department, reporting the measures taken by the attorney general of the colony for the prosecution of Vernon Locke, a man charged with having been concerned in the fraud practiced on the authorities at Long Cay with regard to the Hanover, an American vessel which had been captured by a cruiser sailing under the so-called confederate flag.

I have the honor to be, with high consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

LYONS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD, &c., &c., &c.

Governor Bayley to the Duke of Newcastle.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
Nassau, Bahamas, August 22, 1863.

MY LORD DUKE: In reply to your grace's dispatch No. 305, of the 22d July, I have the honor to communicate to your grace the following particulars furnished by the attorney general respecting the course taken by him in the case of the Hanover.

The attorney general says that in May last he received certain information which pointed to one Vernon Locke as the person who had taken the Hanover into Long Cay, and who, by means of fraudulent personation and representations, procured the admission of that vessel to entry at the revenue office, and effected the sale of her cargo there.

When this information reached the attorney general, Vernon Locke was in Nassau. That officer apprises me that he then caused Locke to be arrested, and a preliminary examination to be taken before the acting police magistrate. This examination was not concluded in time to bring the case to trial during the session of the criminal court which has recently terminated. It has since been brought to a close, and the offense being a bailable one, the police magistrate has taken bail for the appearance of the accused at the general court in October next, but as the informations have not been returned to the attorney general's office, that gentleman is unable to state the amount of the bail exacted.

I have, &c.,

O. J. BAYLEY, *Governor.*

DUKE OF NEWCASTLE, &c., &c., &c.

P. S.—I have since learned that Locke has given bail himself in £200, and two sureties in £100 each.

O. J. B.

Mr. Seward to Lord Lyons.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 10, 1863.

MY LORD: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your note of the 2d instant, transmitting a copy of a dispatch from the governor of the Bahama Islands to her Majesty's secretary of state for the colonial department, reporting the proceedings in the case of the schooner Hanover, of Boston, captured by the insurgent privateer Retribution, and taken to Long Cay, one of the Bahamas.

The bail required in the case seems surprisingly small and insignificant. This government, however, trusts that the prosecution will be conducted to a result which will vindicate the justice of the British government.

I have the honor to be, with high consideration, your lordship's obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

Right Hon. LORD LYONS, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 1278.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 25, 1865.

SIR: You may well be weary of the task of presenting complaints to her Majesty's government, as the ministry is of receiving them. Nevertheless, the rights of the United States and their dignity must be maintained, nor can the just sensibilities of the people be wisely treated with neglect.

I give you herewith a copy of a correspondence between Thomas Kirkpatrick, esq., United States consul at Nassau, and his excellency the governor of that province, and I have to request that you will bring the case which it presents to the notice of Earl Russell.

One of the United States steamships of war, the *San Jacinto*, was wrecked upon a desolate cay of the Bahamas, and her officers and crew, except such of the latter as deserted their flag and found shelter in the port of Nassau, provided for themselves as well as they could until relief was sent them from the United States. The wreckers recovered from the ill-fated vessel certain movables, and presented their claims for salvage. They required, as they lawfully might, coin in payment of that salvage. Nassau was considered the most convenient port for procuring it. The Honduras proceeded thither to procure the coin. The United States consul, in compliance with the requirement of the Queen's proclamation, asked permission for her to enter. The governor denied permission, declaring that the proclamation forbade the entrance of United States ships of war, except in cases of grave emergency and of real necessity and distress.

It is true that the Honduras herself was not in distress, but she was on an errand consequent upon a case of actual distress, and to make to British subjects the remuneration due to them for the practice of humanity in that case of distress. Not only was the permission refused, but the governor, with manifest want of kindness and of consideration to the United States, broke out into remonstrances with the officers of the United States for having landed upon the colonial shore on the occasion.

Earl Russell knows human nature too well to be surprised when I state that the Naval Department has brought this severity of the governor toward the United States agents into contrast with the treatment accorded to rebels against the United States, engaged in trade at the Bahamas, in violation of the Queen's proclamation. There was no day, during the month in which this incident happened, that thirty-five blockade-runners were not seen flaunting their contraband flags in the port of Nassau, nor has the hospitality of that port been restricted to contraband merchant vessels. The *Chameleon*, formerly the *Tallahassee*, a Liverpool pirate, was lying at that very time in the port, relieved indeed of her guns, as well as of her infamous name, but yet still possessing attributes of a pirate. Only a few days earlier the *Laurel*, a merchant vessel then in the very process of being converted into a pirate, under her new baptismal name of the Confederate States, was harbored in that very port, after having carried from Liverpool to the Sea King the armament, upon receiving which she became the pirate ship *Shenandoah*. Nor is it forgotten that the *Oreto* found shelter in Nassau when undergoing a sea change into a pirate ship of war, under the name of *Florida*.

I desire it to be understood that this government does not adopt this painful view of the proceedings of the governor of Nassau, nor does it.

believe that her Majesty's ministers would have authorized or justified the illiberal proceeding of the governor in the case of the Honduras. On the contrary, it is believed that the case in question was unforeseen when the regulations under which the governor is acting were made. Nevertheless, these reservations can neither be known nor felt by the nation whose sensibilities have been wounded in these transactions.

It ought to be unnecessary to expostulate in our communications with the enlightened government of Great Britain upon the evil fruits of petty irritations on border lines and in colonial ports. The unhappy state of things that has arisen in Canada is quite enough of experience of that sort for the instruction of both nations. Just now such vexatious incidents in the British West Indies are of special importance. Only one considerable seaport town in the region of the insurrection remains in rebel possession; all the rest of the ports have been wrested from them, and that one, as well as every inferior harbor, is hermetically sealed against foreign commerce by blockade. The occasion for which the British policy of recognizing the insurgents as a naval belligerent was adopted has passed away, and it even now operates only to favor the piratical vessels of the Mersey and the Clyde, whose business, like that of the Canadian raiders, it is to make, if possible, an incurable breach between the United States and Great Britain. I pray Earl Russell to consider seriously whether the time has not come for a revision of the maritime policy of Great Britain toward the United States.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[For inclosures see dispatch No. 926 of Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward, dated April 13, 1865, *post*.]

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 926.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, April 13, 1865.

SIR: Under the directions contained in your No. 1278, of the 25th of February, I addressed a note to Lord Russell on the 15th of March, on the subject of the visit to Nassau of the United States steamer Honduras, a copy of which is herewith transmitted. His lordship has replied to the separate points in two notes of the same date, the 5th of April, copies of which are also sent.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, March 15, 1865.

MY LORD: It is with much regret that I find it my duty to lay before your lordship copies of papers herewith transmitted.

It appears that some time since one of the United States steamships of war, the *San Jacinto*, was wrecked upon a desolate cay of the Bahamas. Her officers and crew found shelter at Nassau until relief could be obtained from the United States. The wreckers, who had recovered certain portions of the movables of the vessel, presented their claim for salvage, the payment of which they required in coin. Nassau being considered as the most convenient point for settling this claim, the steamer *Honduras* proceeded thither for the purpose of procuring the coin with which to adjust the transaction. The consul of the United States, in compliance with the terms of her Majesty's proclamation, solicited permission for her to enter. That permission was at once refused by the governor, on the ground that it was not a case within the exceptions provided by the proclamation. It is true that the *Honduras* was not in distress, but she was bound on an errand made necessary by a case of distress, and one which was to remunerate British subjects for services rendered in that distress. Not only was this consideration utterly neglected by the governor, but in a spirit certainly not often manifested during this war. He broke out into remonstrances with the officers of the United States for having themselves landed in a boat upon the shore.

I shall not seek to dwell on the painful impression this proceeding has made in the naval department of the United States, which at the same time had but too much reason to be cognizant of the abuse made of that port by persons practically engaged in hostilities in violation of her Majesty's proclamation.

There was no single day during the month in which this incident happened that thirty-five vessels engaged in breaking the blockade were not to be seen flaunting their contraband flags in that port. Neither has its hospitality been restricted to that hybrid class of British ships running its illegal ventures on joint account with the insurgent authorities in the United States. The *Chameleon*, not inaptly named, but before known as the *Tallahassee*, and still earlier as a British steamer fitted out from London to play the part of a privateer, out of Wilmington, was lying at that very time in Nassau, relieved indeed of her guns, but still retaining all the attributes of her hostile occupation. But a few days earlier the steamer *Laurel*, whose history is already too well known to your lordship, by my note of the 7th instant, had reappeared after its assumption of the name of the Confederate States, and had there been not only received, but commissioned with a post mail to a port of her Majesty's kingdom.

Neither is it overlooked that Nassau was the point at which the *Oreto* found shelter when undergoing a sea change which converted her into a vessel to prey upon the unresisting commerce of the people of the United States. I am instructed to explain to your lordship that my government does not intend to be understood as adopting this painful view of the proceedings of the governor of New Providence. Neither is it disposed to believe that her Majesty's ministers would have authorized this illiberal proceeding in the case of the *Honduras*. On the contrary, it is thought that this could hardly have been foreseen when the regulations under which the governor is acting were made. Nevertheless, it must equally be affirmed that these reservations cannot be known or felt by the nation whose sensibilities are naturally wounded in these transactions.

With a government so enlightened as that of Great Britain I cannot but regard it as superfluous to deal in further expostulations with your lordship upon the evil fruits of petty irritations on border lines and in colonial ports.

The unhappy state of things on the Canadian border has furnished too unpleasant an experience of that sort for the instruction of both nations. Just at this time vexatious incidents in her Majesty's West Indian ports are of more than usual importance. But a single considerable seaport town in the whole region of insurrection remains in the possession of the insurgents. That one, as well as every inferior harbor, is hermetically sealed by blockade. Every movement hereafter attempted on the ocean by the insurgents can be carried on only by illegal acts of equipment in the ports of nations with which the United States are bound in treaties of peace and amity. There can be no such thing as a belligerent vessel of the insurgents on the high seas which is not the offspring of fraud or of a violation of the neutrality of foreign powers.

I am, therefore, instructed to suggest to your lordship the consideration, whether the further recognition of this right does not simply operate to favor the machinations of these unscrupulous enemies of both countries, whose business it is, by fitting out ships and enlisting men from the Mersey and the Clyde to carry on war against the United States, to make, if possible, an incurable breach between the two countries.

I have, &c.,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

[Inclosure No. 1.]

Mr. Kirkpatrick to Governor Rawson.

UNITED STATES CONSULATE,
Nassau, N. P., January 30, 1865.

SIR: I have the honor to call your excellency's attention to the article in the Charleston Mercury of the 24th instant, in regard to the steamer *Rattlesnake*, now in this harbor, and which is expected to leave for some port unknown to me to-morrow morning, the Tallahassee being also here, and to ask of your excellency to cause an investigation to be had in regard to their character and purposes. Will your excellency please to return the paper when examined, as it does not belong to me.

I have the honor to be your obedient servant,

THOMAS KIRKPATRICK.

His Excellency RAWSON W. RAWSON, C. B.,
Governor of the Bahamas.

[Inclosure No. 2.]

Mr. Nesbet to Mr. Kirkpatrick.

COLONIAL SECRETARY'S OFFICE,
Nassau, January 31, 1865.

SIR: I am directed by the governor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of yesterday, inclosing a newspaper referring to the character of the steamer *Rattlesnake*, which has recently entered this harbor, and to inform you that there is nothing in your letter or its inclosure which appears to his excellency to create a suspicion against it greater than that which attaches to every vessel of the same class with which this harbor is filled, or to call for any action on the part of the government

beyond that of vigilance, which is already exercised with regard to all vessels engaged in trade with the southern States.

I have the honor to be, sir, your most obedient and humble servant,

C. B. NESBET,
Colonial Secretary.

THOMAS KIRKPATRICK, Esq.,
United States Consul, Nassau.

[Inclosure No. 3.]

Mr. Kirkpatrick to Governor Rawson.

UNITED STATES CONSULATE,
Nassau, January 31, 1865.

SIR: I have the honor to ask your excellency's permission for the United States ship of war Honduras, Captain Harris, to anchor in the harbor to transact some business with this consulate in regard to payment of salvage to the wreckers of the United States ship San Jacinto, lately wrecked.

I am, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

THOMAS KIRKPATRICK.

His Excellency RAWSON W. RAWSON, C. B.,
Governor of Bahamas.

[Inclosure No. 4.]

Mr. Nesbet to Mr. Kirkpatrick.

COLONIAL SECRETARY'S OFFICE,
Nassau, January 31, 1865.

SIR: I am directed by the governor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of this date, and, in reply, to express his excellency's regret that he is restricted from granting the leave requested on behalf of the United States ship of war Honduras to anchor in this harbor to transact some business with this consulate in regard to payment of salvage to the wreckers of the United States ship San Jacinto, lately wrecked, except "in cases of grave emergency, and of real necessity and distress;" and his excellency requests that you will lose no time in conveying this reply to the commander of the Honduras.

I have the honor to be, sir, your most obedient servant,

C. B. NESBET,
Colonial Secretary.

THOMAS KIRKPATRICK, Esq.,
United States Consul, Nassau, N. P.

[Inclosure No. 5.]

Mr. Nesbet to Mr. Kirkpatrick.

COLONIAL SECRETARY'S OFFICE,
Nassau, February 2, 1865.

SIR: The governor has received a report from the health officer, dated yesterday, notifying that "the passengers, officers, &c., from an American steamer, then in the offing, were on shore, having landed without his

being able to visit the vessel." His excellency presumes that this has reference to the United States steamer Honduras, regarding which you communicated with him on the afternoon of the 31st ultimo. He has therefore directed me to request that you will have the goodness to inform him of the circumstances under which a boat, or boats, landed from the steamer in question, in breach of the quarantine regulations, and under which the Honduras remained off the mouth of this harbor until a late hour of yesterday, after the communications, both written and oral, which his excellency made to you and to her commander on the preceding afternoon.

I have the honor to be, sir, your most obedient servant,
C. R. NESBET,
Colonial Secretary.

THOMAS KIRKPATRICK, Esq.,
United States Consul, Nassau.

[Inclosure No. 6.]

Mr. Kirkpatrick to Mr. Nesbet.

UNITED STATES CONSULATE,
Nassau, February 3, 1865.

SIR: I have the honor to receive your communication of yesterday, informing me that the governor has received a report from the health officer, dated yesterday, 1st instant, notifying that "the passengers, officers, &c., from an American steamer, then in the offing, were on shore, having landed without his being able to visit the vessel;" and you add, "that his excellency presumes that this has reference to the United States steamer Honduras, regarding which you (I) communicated with him on the afternoon of the 31st ultimo," and ask me to inform his excellency the governor of the circumstances, &c. All I know of the matter is briefly this: that after the interview had with his excellency on the afternoon in question, Captain Harris left for his ship, and succeeded in reaching her, then in the offing, and after reaching her, stood out to sea; that on the next morning himself and two other officers, as I understood, although only himself and one other were in my office, and did some business, leaving some dispatches which had been intrusted to him to be forwarded by mail, and, I believe, purchased some small stores, (this is only known to me by their statements,) and immediately after left for the ship. I am very positive, if the health officer means the officers, &c., of the Honduras, that there was no intention on their part, or knowledge, that they were violating any law of this colony, and can only add my personal regrets it should have occurred.

I am, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

THOMAS KIRKPATRICK.

Hon. CHARLES R. NESBET,
Colonial Secretary of Bahamas.

[Inclosure No. 7.]

Mr. Nesbet to Mr. Kirkpatrick.

COLONIAL SECRETARY'S OFFICE,
Nassau, February 4, 1865.

SIR: I am directed by the governor to acknowledge your letter of the 3d instant, stating the circumstances under which boats and officers from

the United States steamer Honduras twice landed from that ship, in disregard, in both instances, of the quarantine regulations of this harbor, and in opposition, on the second occasion, to her Majesty's orders and directions, laid down for the guidance of ships of war belonging to the United States, and to the intimations conveyed to yourself and Captain Harris that his excellency could not grant his permission to enter the harbor.

Captain Harris could not have been ignorant of the regulations existing in this and most other civilized countries, which prohibit persons from leaving a vessel arriving at a port until it shall have been boarded and permission granted by the competent officer. The proper course for obtaining this is known to every naval officer. It is presumed that, as consul, you must be familiar with the local law on the subject, and that you must have informed Captain Harris that he was acting in contravention of the law.

Captain Harris must have been aware that United States ships are forbidden to enter the ports or waters of any place in her Majesty's dominions, except under stress of weather, or some other extraordinary circumstances; and, in the latter case, only after having received permission to do so. Such permission was given to the United States steamer Honduras to enter the waters of Abaco, for the purpose of lending assistance to the wrecked ship of war San Jacinto, but her commander was informed that the governor was restricted from giving it to her to enter those of this island, even in the interest of inhabitants of this colony.

It is true that the governor only denied his permission to anchor; but you must be aware, and Captain Harris must be aware, that both the letter and spirit of the Queen's proclamation, and the whole tenor of the communication with his excellency on the afternoon of the day on which he first landed, prohibited his further communication with the shore, as much as his anchoring in British waters. Captain Harris must also have known that the taking in of stores of any kind without the governor's permission was contrary to her Majesty's orders and directions, which are framed with a view of preventing the ships of war of both belligerent parties in the neighboring continent from entering British waters or communicating with the shore, under any circumstances, except in such stress of weather, or such other difficulty, as might endanger the safety of the ship.

His excellency very much regrets this occurrence. As an act of courtesy he abstained from requesting Captain Harris at once to leave the shore, and to remove his ship from the mouth of the harbor; but if he could have anticipated that Captain Harris would have come on shore again, and that his ship would have remained off the mouth of the harbor until a late hour on the following day, it would have been his duty, however distasteful the necessity, to have made this request direct to that officer.

His excellency hopes that you will spare him the necessity, on any similar occasion, by cautioning the commanders of all United States ships of war entering these waters, and that you will exert your influence to prevent any infringement of the Queen's territorial rights by ships and subjects of the United States. The governor has already evinced his desire to use every endeavor to prevent such infringements by the belligerents on the other side, or by parties interested in their cause.

I have the honor to be, sir, your most obedient servant,
O. R. NESBET, *Colonial Secretary.*

THOMAS KIRKPATRICK, Esq.,
United States Consul, Nassau.

[Inclosure No. 8.]

*Mr. Kirkpatrick to Mr. Nesbet.*UNITED STATES CONSULATE,
Nassau, February 7, 1865.

SIR: I had the honor to receive yesterday afternoon your communication of the 4th instant. I do not intend to enter into any discussion whether it was, or was not, a violation of her Majesty's proclamation for a boat to land from a ship belonging to the government of the United States, cruising in the offing, or whether it was a violation of the laws of this colony regarding quarantine regulations; nor will I discuss why vessels belonging to other governments have been permitted to enter the harbor, or land, without let or hindrance, or complaint, as far as I am aware; but I must be permitted to say that I am surprised at the tone of your letter, insisting that Captain Harris was aware of his committing a violation of these laws, when taken in connection with the conversation had with his excellency the governor the afternoon when Captain Harris and myself had the honor to converse with him in regard to his (Captain Harris's) errand to Nassau, and the reasons for desiring to anchor inside the bar. I shall give the details of that conversation, and all the facts necessary to a full understanding of the subject, to the Department of State of the United States of America, and leave future discussion regarding it where it more properly belongs.

I have the honor to be your most obedient servant,

THOMAS KIRKPATRICK.

Hon. CHARLES R. NESBET,
Colonial Secretary of Bahamas.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, April 5, 1865.

SIR: In answer to your letter of the 15th of March, I have the honor to state to you that it has been the endeavor of her Majesty's government to carry into effect with fairness and impartiality the duties of neutrality between the government of the United States and those parties who had risen in arms against their authority. Nassau is a position from which, on the one hand, confederate privateers might have greatly annoyed the commerce of the United States, and which, on the other hand, might have been a convenient base of operations for the United States navy.

It was thought right, therefore, by her Majesty's government to forbid the resort of men-of-war of either of the two parties to the port of Nassau.

I send you a printed copy of the orders issued to this effect on the 31st of January, 1862.

Governor Rawson, who has been exceedingly strict in compelling the confederate vessels to comply with the rules which he was ordered to enforce, has no doubt conceived it to be his duty to require equal compliance with those rules from the United States vessels of war. Her Majesty's government, if the case had been referred to them, might, in all probability, have dispensed with the observance of these rules in the peculiar case of the Honduras; but her Majesty's government cannot be

surprised that an inferior officer should not have conceived himself at liberty, upon his own responsibility, to dispense with rules laid down by her Majesty for his guidance. I have to observe, moreover, that the landing of the captain of the Honduras and his officers was persisted in not only in contravention of the express dissent of the governor and in violation of the rules which the governor had been ordered to cause to be observed, but in contravention also of the quarantine laws of the colony. This is a proceeding which Mr. Seward, I conceive, will surely not consider to have been justifiable.

You are perfectly aware that there is nothing in the law of nations which forbids the attempt of neutral ship-owners or commanders to evade the blockade, taking, thereby, upon themselves the risk of capture and condemnation.

British merchants have made use of this chance of profit, and have submitted to the capture and condemnation with which such chance is liable to be accompanied.

American merchants, when neutrals, have availed themselves of similar chances of profit, attended with similar risk. With respect to the latter part of your letter of the 15th ultimo, suggesting that certain consequences ought to arise from the present altered position of the seaports of the Confederate States, I can only say that her Majesty's government will feel bound to continue, as they have heretofore done, to prevent, to the utmost of their power, the violation of her Majesty's rights and of her Majesty's declared neutrality.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[Extract from the London Gazette of the 31st January, 1862.]

Copy of a letter from Earl Russell to her lords commissioners of the admiralty

FOREIGN OFFICE, January 31, 1862.

MY LORDS: Her Majesty, being fully determined to observe the duties of neutrality during the existing hostilities between the United States and the States calling themselves the "Confederate States of America," and being, moreover, resolved to prevent, as far as possible, the use of her Majesty's harbors, ports, and coasts, and the waters within her Majesty's territorial jurisdiction, in aid of the warlike purposes of either belligerent, has commanded me to communicate to your lordships, for your guidance, the following rules, which are to be treated and enforced as her Majesty's orders and directions.

Her Majesty is pleased further to command that these rules shall be put in force in the United Kingdom and the Channel Islands on and after Thursday, the 6th day of February next, and in her Majesty's territories and possessions beyond the seas, six days after the day when the governor or other chief authority of each of such territories or possessions, respectively, shall have notified and published the same, stating in such notification that the said rules are to be obeyed by all persons within the same territories and possessions.

I. During the continuance of the present hostilities between the government of the United States of North America and the States calling

themselves "the Confederate States of America," or until her Majesty shall otherwise order, no ship of war or privateer belonging to either of the belligerents shall be permitted to enter or remain in the port of Nassau, or in any other port, roadstead, or waters of the Bahama Islands, except by special leave of the lieutenant governor of the Bahama Islands, or in case of stress of weather. If any such vessel should enter any such port, roadstead, or waters, by special leave or under stress of weather, the authorities of the place shall require her to put to sea as soon as possible, without permitting her to take in any supplies, beyond what may be necessary for her immediate use.

If, at the time when this order is first notified in the Bahama Islands, there shall be any such vessel already within any port, roadstead, or waters of those islands, the lieutenant governor shall give notice to such vessel to depart, and shall require her to put to sea, within such time as he shall, under the circumstances, consider proper and reasonable. If there shall then be ships of war or privateer belonging to both the said belligerents within the territorial jurisdiction of her Majesty, in or near the same port, roadstead, or waters, the lieutenant governor shall fix the order of time in which such vessels shall depart. No such vessel of either belligerent shall be permitted to put to sea until after the expiration of at least twenty-four hours from the time when the last preceding vessel of the other belligerent, (whether the same be a ship of war, or privateer, or merchant ship,) which shall have left the same port, roadstead, or waters, or waters adjacent thereto, shall have passed beyond the territorial jurisdiction of her Majesty.

II. During the continuance of the present hostilities between the government of the United States of North America and the States calling themselves "the Confederate States of America," all ships of war and privateers of either belligerent are prohibited from making use of any port or roadstead in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, or in the Channel Islands, or in any of her Majesty's colonies or foreign possessions or dependencies, or of any waters subject to the territorial jurisdiction of the British Crown, as a station or place of resort for any warlike purpose or for the purpose of obtaining any facilities of warlike equipment; and no ship of war or privateer of either belligerent shall hereafter be permitted to sail out or leave any port, roadstead, or waters subject to British jurisdiction, from which any vessel of the other belligerent (whether the same shall be a ship of war, a privateer, or a merchant ship) shall have previously departed, until after the expiration of at least twenty-four hours from the departure of such last-mentioned vessel beyond the territorial jurisdiction of her Majesty.

III. If any ship of war or privateer of either belligerent shall, after the time when this order shall be first notified and put in force in the United Kingdom and in the Channel Islands, and in the several colonies and foreign possessions and dependencies of her Majesty, respectively, enter any port, roadstead, or waters belonging to her Majesty, either in the United Kingdom or in the Channel Islands, or in any of her Majesty's colonies or foreign possessions or dependencies, such vessel shall be required to depart and to put to sea within twenty-four hours after her entrance into such port, roadstead, or waters, except in case of stress of weather or of her requiring provisions or things necessary for the subsistence of her crew, or repairs; in either of which cases, the authorities of the port, or of the nearest port, (as the case may be,) shall require her to put to sea as soon as possible after the expiration of such period of twenty-four hours, without permitting her to take in supplies beyond what may be necessary for immediate use; and no such vessel, which may have been

allowed to remain within British waters for the purpose of repair, shall continue in any such port, roadstead, or waters for a longer period than twenty-four hours after her necessary repairs shall have been completed: provided, nevertheless, that in all cases in which there shall be any vessels (whether ships of war, privateers, or merchant ships) of both the said belligerent parties in the same port, roadstead, or waters within the territorial jurisdiction of her Majesty, there shall be an interval of not less than twenty-four hours between the departure therefrom of any such vessel (whether a ship of war, a privateer, or a merchant ship) of the one belligerent, and the subsequent departure therefrom of any ship of war or privateer of the other belligerent; and the times hereby limited for the departure of such ships of war and privateers, respectively, shall always, in case of necessity, be extended, so far as may be requisite for giving effect to this proviso, but not further or otherwise.

IV. No ship of war or privateer of either belligerent shall hereafter be permitted, while in any port, roadstead, or waters subject to the territorial jurisdiction of her Majesty, to take in any supplies, except provisions and such other things as may be requisite for the subsistence of her crew, and except so much coal only as may be sufficient to carry such vessel to the nearest port of her own country, or to some nearer destination; and no coal shall be again supplied to any such ship of war or privateer in the same or any other port, roadstead, or waters subject to the territorial jurisdiction of her Majesty, without special permission, until after the expiration of three months from the time when such coal may have been last supplied to her within British waters as aforesaid.

I have, &c.,

RUSSELL.

NOTE.—A similar letter has been addressed to the secretaries of state for the home, colonial, war, and India departments, and to the lords commissioners of her Majesty's treasury.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, April 5, 1865.

SIR: In your note of the 15th ultimo you have referred to the arrival of the steamer Chameleon at Nassau. You are no doubt also aware that the steamer Rattlesnake had likewise reached that port, and you have been, probably, informed that the United States consul at Nassau specially called the attention of the governor of the Bahamas to these vessels. It will, therefore, interest you to learn, if you do not know it already, that the governor of the Bahamas caused the United States consul to be informed that there was nothing in his letter to create a suspicion against those vessels, greater than that which attached to every vessel of the same class with which the harbor of Nassau was filled; or to call for any action on the part of the colonial government beyond that of vigilance, which was already exercised with regard to all vessels engaged in trade with the southern States.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Hunter to Mr. Adams.

No. 1366.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 24, 1865.

SIR: I transmit herewith a copy of a letter of the 12th instant, which the Secretary of the Navy has addressed to this department, respecting the proceedings of his excellency the governor of the Bahamas, in refusing to allow a United States vessel of war to enter the port of Abaco, for the purpose of removing certain property which was saved from the wreck of the United States steamer San Jacinto. I have to request you to call the attention of her Majesty's government to the want of international comity evinced by the governor of the Bahamas, on the occasion referred to.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

W. HUNTER,
Acting Secretary.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Welles to Mr. Seward.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 12, 1865.

SIR: The United States steamer San Jacinto, under the command of Captain R. W. Meade, having been recently wrecked on a reef near the island of Abaco, Bahamas, Captain Meade deemed it expedient to avail himself of the services of a police magistrate of Abaco, named I. Nibbs Brown, as an agent for supervising the affairs of the wrecked vessel, and taking charge of the property saved from it.

A dispatch received by the department from Acting Rear-Admiral Stribling, commanding the east Gulf squadron, to which the San Jacinto was attached, incloses a copy of a letter from Mr. Brown, in which he states that his excellency the governor of the Bahamas has directed him to relinquish the agency for the wrecked vessel. Mr. Brown further writes to Rear-Admiral Stribling in these words:

"The emergency or necessity connected with the wreck having ceased, it will not be practicable for me to permit one of your armed vessels to enter this port for the transmission of the articles in warehouse; you will therefore be pleased to arrange for their transport by a vessel of another description. Should you advise it, I may be able to procure a vessel here at a reasonable rate."

I beg leave to call your attention to this proceeding on the part of the British authority in the Bahamas, which wears the appearance of an unnecessary departure from international comity.

I have the honor to be your obedient servant,

GIDEON WELLES,
Secretary of the Navy.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

BLOCKADE RUNNING.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, November 1, 1861.

SIR: All the information lately received at this legation combines to establish the fact of extraordinary activity in forwarding supplies of every kind to the insurgents. The success of the Bermuda has tempted the agents to stretch every nerve in the further prosecution of similar enterprises. There is no doubt now that another steamer is almost ready, particulars of which you will receive by other channels. Two sailing vessels and a light steamer are also purchased, and they will be made ready as soon as possible. In the meanwhile a considerable quantity of arms is coming over to the coast by the way of Hamburg, and a great many of the establishments in Birmingham and London are busied turning out a large number of rifles, as well as other arms, every week for the same destination. It is reported to me that on board of the Edinburgh came a man by the name of Semmes, who is supposed to be the late commander of the Sumter, and that he is to take command of one of the vessels now fitting out, I presume, to make her a privateer, so soon as she shall have got out of this jurisdiction.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
 CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 128.] LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, March 7, 1862.

SIR: The dispatch, No. 186, of the 17th of February, transmitting a list of vessels that have been engaged in efforts to run the blockade, has come just in time to add to the materials collected from other sources in advance of the discussion which Mr. Gregory, the member for Galway, proposes to commence in the House of Commons to-night. I much regret there is no full official list from the Navy Department of all vessels turned off or captured. In view of the late course of events, the temper of the people, as well as of the higher classes, grows less and less disposed to interference, so that I regard the sentiments expressed in Parliament, whatever they may be, with very little apprehension. It may be depended upon that, without the occurrence of some very extraordinary event, the government of the United States will not be further molested in its efforts to conduct its experiment of reducing the rebellion, according to its own plan, to some definite result. I think I can say this with more confidence now than at any previous period of my residence here.

But if this be the favorable view of our position in England, it is to be kept in mind, on the other hand, that nearly all of the aid which the rebels obtain to protract the war comes, either directly or indirectly, from

people in Great Britain. The newspapers no longer pretend to conceal the fact of outfits constantly making of steamers from the port of Liverpool with the intention to break the blockade. A large proportion of the vessels in the list from the department, already alluded to, appear to be British. The Bermuda has just gone on her second trip, filled with the heaviest cargo of cannon and military stores yet dispatched; whilst the nominal destination of the Oreto to Sicily is the only advantage which appears to have been derived from my attempt to procure the interference of the government to stop her departure. How long this business will be continued, in the face of such discouraging news as has been lately coming over the Atlantic, it is difficult to say. The plain fact in any event remains, that the only preventive policy against what is still doing must be found in the vigilance of our naval cruisers. It might be of use if official intelligence of the captures made by them could be promptly forwarded to this legation, for it is not safe to put confidence in mere newspaper statements. It is the popular idea that the blockade is not effective which stimulates many of the ventures.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 207.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 11, 1862.

SIR: Information derived from our consul at Liverpool confirms reports which have reached us that insurance companies in England are insuring vessels engaged in running our blockade, and even vessels carrying contraband of war. This is, in effect, a combination of British capitalists, under legal authority, to levy war against the United States. It is entirely inconsistent with the relations of friendship, which we, on our part, maintain towards Great Britain; and we cannot believe that her Britannic Majesty's government will regard it as compatible with the attitude of neutrality proclaimed by that government. Its effect is to prolong this struggle, destroy legitimate commerce of British subjects, and excite in this country feelings of deep alienation.

Pray bring this subject to the notice of Earl Russell, and ask for intervention in some form which will be efficient.

Our consuls in London and Liverpool can furnish you with all the information you will require.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 132.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, March 20, 1862.

SIR: Late last evening I received dispatches from the department numbered from 194 to 198, both inclusive. Several of them are highly

important, and I shall seize the earliest opportunity to act upon the suggestions they contain in my communications with her Majesty's government. Indeed, you will before this have received my dispatch No. 131, of the 13th instant, which covered a copy of a note of mine to Lord Russell on the case of the General Miramon, drawn up in the sense conveyed in your No. 184, of the 14th of February. As the efforts of disaffected parties here grow more and more desperate in proportion to the increase of the necessities on the other side of the water, I shall find occasion to renew the subject with additional means of illustration.

I take it for granted that even in the midst of your engrossing occupations you find sufficient time to glance at the report of the debates in Parliament on subjects of interest to the United States, and more especially on international questions of rights on the ocean and of blockade in time of war. The most marked indication to be observed is the general sense of uneasiness at the change operated in the position of Great Britain as a maritime power by the enlargement gradually making of the privileges of neutral nations. Whilst on the opposition side you perceive a distinct disapproval of the agreement made in 1856 at Paris, there is equally perceptible among the ministers a disposition to seize the first opportunity to annul the obligations which it has been thought to impose. The remarks of Sir George Cornwall Lewis upon the effect of war upon the measure, regarded merely as a treaty and not as new rules incorporated into the international law, are full of significance. Lord Palmerston has been not inappropriately reminded of the difference between the tone of his speech at Liverpool, in 1856, and that in the late debate, while even Lord Russell is quoted as having expressed the opinion that some modification of the declaration of Paris would seem to be almost indispensable.

Such are the immediate effects of that which, at first blush, appeared to these enlightened gentlemen a great triumph in the case of the Trent. Such are the consequences of refusing to accept the adhesion of the United States to the declaration of Paris from an over-zealous desire to escape the effect of a precipitate admission of belligerent rights. Both these events have brought vividly to their observation the consideration of the position of Great Britain in the contingency of a war on the ocean. Like the dog in the fable, in snatching at the shadow, they find they have lost the solid meat. A conflict with the United States would, as things are now, at once transfer the whole carrying trade of Great Britain into the hands of the neutral nations of the Continent of Europe. It is now becoming plain that, without the additional provision first suggested by Mr. Marcy, English interests on the sea are in great jeopardy in time of war, and yet that, with the admission of it, the control of the ocean is forever lost. Whichever way they look there is difficulty. Self-interest being the cardinal point of the policy they seek to pursue, it is plain that the adoption of the declaration of Paris is a sacrifice of which they are beginning to repent. Not the least remarkable among the admissions made in this debate is that which specifies the danger of a war with the United States in the event of a persistence in their former doctrine respecting the cargoes of neutral ships, at the time of the contest with Russia, as having been the main cause that prompted the concessions in that declaration. Thus it would seem that the idea of the growing power of the United States as one nation is everywhere present to their imaginations as the great obstacle in the way of their continued domination of the sea. Can it be wondered at if, under these circumstances, the notion of a permanent separation of this power into

two parts, one of which can be played off against the other, were not altogether unwelcome to their hearts?

To considerations of a similar kind are we indebted for the security that has been afforded to us in our present contest against interference with the blockade. That there has been and still is a very strong inclination in the country to get rid of it is unquestionable. That but for its unavoidable connection with possibilities of consequences in other and not very remote complications, an attempt of the kind would have been made, I am strongly inclined to believe. The argument that has overborne all these tendencies is drawn from the fear that such a step would only lead in the same direction with the preceding ones taken at Paris. It would ultimately deprive Britannia of her power longer to rule the waves. The "*entente cordiale*" with France is not yet hearty enough to make such a result altogether acceptable, even to the fancy. Neither are the relations with Russia so friendly as to render a voluntary release of the main instrument to keep her in check, a proposition to be entertained with favor. For these reasons, no countenance will be given to any remonstrance against our blockade; neither will the general reasoning of Mr. Cobden, in favor of limiting the right of blockade, find much response among people in authority. Even the admissions rendered necessary to establish a position in reclaiming the rebel emissaries on board the Trent will be limited, as far as may be, to shut the door against further concessions.

It will then continue to depend upon the degree of concert established among those nations of the world which have ever upheld neutral rights, whether any real advance be made in the recognized doctrines of international law or not, just as it has done in preceding times. Great Britain will concede only from a conviction that such a course is the safest for herself. The remedy for other countries is obvious. It is to unite in the labor of raising the obligations of specific contracts to the level of permanent international law, and to enforce the observation of a consistent system of policy upon any single power whenever it may venture to set up the promptings of its immediate interest as the only rule of action it thinks proper to abide by.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 156.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,

London, May 8, 1862.

SIR: I have received from the department dispatches numbered from 228 to 236, both inclusive.

* * * * *

I transmit a copy of a note received from his lordship, of the 6th instant, in reply to mine, on the case of the steamer Labuan. If I was at a loss to comprehend the reason of the representation volunteered to me on that subject, I am still more so to divine the cause for the turn now given to the correspondence.

I have felt it my duty to point out the nature of the position which he has taken in as subdued a tone as I can command. Feeling that I am

engaged in the responsible duty of making up a solemn issue between the two countries in one of the most momentous struggles of modern times, I am anxious to choose the ground with great care, so that I may hold it with firmness throughout the possible embarrassments that may supervene. A copy of my reply to his lordship accompanies this dispatch.

* * * * *

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

—

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, May 6, 1862.

SIR: I have had the honor to receive your letter of the 30th ultimo.

I am quite willing to leave the case of the Labuan to the zealous exertions of Lord Lyons. It is a plain case of justice, and the representations of her Majesty's government with regard to it ought to be successful.

With regard to the "systematic plan" which you say has been pursued by her Majesty's subjects "to violate the blockade by steady efforts," there are some reflections which I am surprised have not occurred to you.

The United States government, on the allegation of a rebellion pervading from nine to eleven States of the Union, have now for more than twelve months endeavored to maintain a blockade of three thousand miles of coast. This blockade, kept up irregularly, but when enforced, enforced severely, has seriously injured the trade and manufactures of the United Kingdom. Thousands of persons are now obliged to resort to the poor rate for subsistence, owing to this blockade. Yet her Majesty's government have never sought to take advantage of the obvious imperfections of this blockade, in order to declare it ineffective. They have, to the loss and detriment of the British nation, scrupulously observed the duties of Great Britain towards a friendly state. But when her Majesty's government are asked to go beyond this, and to overstep the existing powers given them by municipal and international law for the purpose of imposing arbitrary restrictions on the trade of her Majesty's subjects, it is impossible to listen to such suggestions. The ingenuity of persons engaged in commerce will always, in some degree, defeat attempts to starve or debar from commercial intercourse an extensive coast inhabited by a large and industrious population.

If, therefore, the government of the United States consider it for their interest to inflict this great injury on other nations, the utmost they can expect is that European powers shall respect those acts of the United States which are within the limits of the law. The United States government cannot expect that Great Britain should frame new statutes to aid the federal blockade, and to carry into effect the restrictions on commerce which the United States, for their own purposes, have thought fit to institute, and the application of which it is their duty to confine within the legitimate limits of international law.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, May 8, 1862.

MY LORD: I have to acknowledge the reception of your note of the 6th instant, in which you do me the honor to suggest some thoughts on the injurious effect of the American blockade.

In declaring that blockade the government of the United States are believed to have done nothing which has not been repeatedly done heretofore, and the right to do which at any time hereafter, whenever the necessity shall appear to call for it, is not distinctly affirmed by the government of Great Britain. Neither does the fact that this proceeding pressed with the greatest severity upon the interests of neutral nations appear formerly to have been regarded in any other light than as an incidental damage, which, however much regretted in itself, unavoidably follows from the gravity of the emergency which created it. For it can scarcely be supposed that so onerous a task as a veritable blockade will be undertaken by any nation for causes not deemed of paramount necessity, or will be persevered in one moment longer than those causes continue to operate. I am very sure that it is the desire of the government of the United States to accelerate the period when the blockade now in operation may be safely raised. To that end it is bending all its efforts. And in this it claims to be mindful not simply of the interests of its own citizens, but likewise of those of all friendly nations. Hence it is that it views with deep regret the strenuous efforts of evil-disposed persons in foreign countries, by undertakings carried on in defiance of all recognized law, to impair, so far as they can, the efficacy of its measures, and in a corresponding degree to protract the severity of the struggle. Hence it is, likewise, that it has been profoundly concerned at the inefficacy of the laws of Great Britain, in which a large proportion of the undertakings originate, to apply any adequate policy of prevention. For I doubt not your lordship will see at a glance the embarrassment in which a country is necessarily involved by complaints raised of the continued severity of a blockade by a friendly nation which, at the same time, confesses its inability to restrain its subjects from stimulating the resistance that necessitates a continuance of the very state of things of which they make complaint.

That a sense of the difficulties consequent upon the action of such persons prompted the enactment of the statute of his Majesty George the Third of the 3d July, 1819, is made plain by the language of its preamble. It is therein stated that it was passed because the laws then in force were not sufficiently effectual to prevent the evil complained of. It now appears, from the substance of the representations which I have heretofore had the honor to make to your lordship, that the provisions of that law are as little effectual in curing the evil as those of any of its predecessors. But I am pained to be obliged to gather from the concluding words of your lordship's note that the expression of an opinion that the United States, in the execution of a measure conceded to be correct, as well as justified by every precedent of international law as construed by the highest British authorities, cannot expect that Great Britain should frame new statutes to remedy the deficiency of its own laws to prevent what it acknowledges on the face of that statute to be evils created by its own refractory subjects. I must be permitted to say, in reply, that, in my belief, the government of the United States would scarcely be disposed to make a similar reply to her Majesty's

government were the relative position of the two countries to be reversed.

Permit me, in conclusion, to assure your lordship that the grounds upon which the representations I have had the honor to make [were founded] have not been hastily considered. So far from it, the extent of the evil complained of has been under rather than overstated. I have now before me a list of eleven steamers and ten sailing vessels that have been equipped and dispatched within thirty days, or are now preparing, freighted with supplies of all kinds for the insurgents from one port of Great Britain alone. These supplies, I have reason to believe, are to be conveyed to Nassau, which place is used as an entrepot for the convenience of vessels under British colors employed for the sole purpose of breaking the blockade. I have reasons for supposing that the business is reduced to a system, emanating from a central authority situated in London; and, further, that large sums of money have been contributed by British subjects to aid in carrying it on. If the United States have in any of their relations with her Majesty's government committed some act not within the legitimate limits of international law which justifies the declaration of a disposition not to provide against such obvious violations of the neutrality proclaimed at the outset of this deplorable struggle, I trust I may be permitted to ask that it may be so clearly presented to their consideration by your lordship as to supply the means either of explanation or of remedy.

Renewing to your lordship the assurances of my highest consideration, I have the honor to be, my lord, your most obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANCOIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. Lord JOHN RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 281.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 26, 1862.

SIR: It is my painful duty to bring, through you, to the notice of the British government, facts in relation to the port of Nassau, a possession of her Britannic Majesty near the southern extremity of the United States, which are believed to be unquestionable. From the commencement of the present rebellion in this country, and especially since the establishment of the blockade, that port has been used as a place of deposit by the insurgents for munitions of war sent thither for their use by their agents and sympathizers in England. Sometimes the vessels in which they were carried thither have attempted to evade the blockade, and in a few instances may have succeeded. The main object in the choice of the site, however, seems to have been the facility with which contraband of war, transhipped to small schooners and similar vessels with little draught of water, might in darkness run into inlets on the southern coast of the island too shallow to allow them to be pursued by such vessels of war as can safely be used in enforcing the blockade.

Recently, however, a gunboat called the *Oreto*, built in England for the service of the insurgents, with ports and bolts for twenty guns, and other equipments to correspond, arrived at Nassau. The facts in regard to her having come to the knowledge of the United States consul, he made a protest upon the subject and she was seized by the authorities. She was, however, released immediately after the arrival at Nassau,

on the 8th instant, of Captain Semmes, late commander of the pirate *Sumter*, and the consul informed this department that she was about to start on a privateering cruise. He has also represented that there were then in that port eleven large British steamers laden with contraband of war for the insurgents in this country.

The release by the authorities at Nassau of the *Oreto*, under the circumstances mentioned, seems to be particularly at variance with her Britannic Majesty's proclamation of neutrality, and I am commanded by the President to protest against it, and to ask the consideration of her Majesty's government upon the proceeding as one calculated to alarm the government and people of the United States. I am also directed to ask the like consideration of her Majesty's government upon the manner in which the island of Nassau has been used as a deposit for arms and munitions of war intended for the insurgents in the United States.

You are charged with the duty of laying this subject before the British government. The legislative and executive authority of the United States having been exerted toward preventing similar proceedings by persons within our jurisdiction during the insurrection in Canada in 1837, we may claim on this ground at least a reciprocity from the British government.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[Communicated to Lord Russell, July 31, 1862. See Mr. Adams's dispatch to Mr. Seward, No. 201, dated August 1, 1862, under the head "Rebel Cruisers," subdivision "The Florida," *post.*]

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 205.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,

London, August 7, 1862.

SIR: In my dispatch (No. 201) of the 1st instant, it may be recollected that I reported Lord Russell as making a conditional promise to furnish me with a copy of his letter to the Liverpool merchants, about the uses made by them of the port of Nassau. On the evening of the 4th instant I received a note transmitting the copy, but with a restriction that it was given in confidence. The next day, however, I received a Liverpool newspaper, in which the letter seems to have been inserted by the parties to whom it was addressed. Since then it has appeared in all the London papers. I therefore feel myself at liberty to transmit a copy of Lord Russell's note and of its inclosure.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

Secretary of State.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

[Confidential.]

FOREIGN OFFICE, *August 4, 1862.*

Lord Russell presents his compliments to Mr. Adams, and has the honor to forward to him herewith, confidentially, for his information,

a copy of a letter which Lord Russell caused to be addressed to Mr. Horsfall in reply to a memorial forwarded by him from certain British merchants and ship-owners in Liverpool respecting the proceedings of the United States cruisers off the Bahamas.

Mr. Layard to Mr. Horsfall.

FOREIGN OFFICE, July 5, 1862.

SIR: I am directed by Earl Russell to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 2d instant, inclosing a memorial from certain British merchants and ship-owners at Liverpool, in which they state that they view with considerable anxiety and apprehension the hostile attitude assumed by federal cruisers in the Bahama waters, and the memorialists pray that steps may be taken by her Majesty's government to protect British shipping in those waters, and to put a check on the seizures so repeatedly made by the federal cruisers.

I am to state to you, in reply, that it is alleged on the other hand by Mr. Seward and Mr. Adams that ships have been sent from this country to America with a fixed purpose to run the blockade; that high premiums of insurance have been paid with this view, and that arms and ammunition have been thus conveyed to the southern States to enable them to carry on the war. Lord Russell was unable either to deny the truth of those allegations or to prosecute to conviction the parties engaged in those transactions. But he cannot be surprised that the cruisers of the United States should watch with vigilance a port which is said to be the great entrepôt of this commerce.

Her Majesty's government have no reason to doubt the equity and adherence to legal requirements of the United States prize courts. But he is aware that many vessels are subject to harsh treatment, and that, if captured, the loss to the merchant is far from being compensated even by a favorable decision in a prize court.

The true remedy would be that the merchants and ship-owners of Liverpool should refrain from this species of trade. It exposes innocent commerce to vexatious detention and search by American cruisers; it produces irritation and ill-will on the part of the population of the northern States of America; it is contrary to the spirit of her Majesty's proclamation; and it exposes the British name to suspicions of bad faith, to which neither her Majesty's government nor the great body of the nation are justly obnoxious.

It is true, indeed, that supplies of arms and ammunition have been sent to the federals equally in contravention of that neutrality which her Majesty has proclaimed. It is true, also, that the federals obtain more freely and more easily that of which they stand in need. But if the confederates had the command of the sea they would no doubt watch as vigilantly and capture as readily British vessels going to New York as the federals now watch Charleston and capture vessels seeking to break the blockade.

There can be no doubt that the watchfulness exercised by federal cruisers to prevent supplies reaching the confederates by sea will occasionally lead to vexatious visits of merchant ships not engaged in any pursuit to which the federals can properly object. This, however, is an evil to which war on the ocean is liable to expose neutral commerce, and her Majesty's government have done all they can fairly do; that is to

say, they have urged the federal government to enjoin upon their naval officers greater caution in the exercise of their belligerent rights.

Her Majesty's government having represented to the United States government every case in which they were justified in interfering, have only further to observe that it is the duty of her Majesty's subjects to conform to her Majesty's proclamation, and to abstain from furnishing to either of the belligerent parties any of the means of war which are prohibited to be furnished by that proclamation.

I am, sir, &c.,

A. H. LAYARD.

T. B. HORSFALL, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 265.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, November 27, 1862.

SIR: * * * * *

In the mean time the outfits of vessels to run the blockade continue and multiply. I do not as yet obtain the necessary evidence to prove the preparation of war ships, but the arrival in the Arabia of Commander Maury and eight or nine rebel officers, including a Charleston pilot, at Liverpool, would seem to indicate that something is soon to be attempted. I am now waiting for further details of information from the respective consuls, in order to comprise in one view a statement of the hostile operations now going on in the ports of this kingdom, which I propose to submit to the consideration of her Majesty's government.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 286.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, January 1, 1863.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit a copy of my note to Earl Russell of the 30th ultimo, which, in my dispatch No. 281, of the 25th of December, I mentioned that I was preparing in answer to a portion of his note of the 19th of that month, which I sent forward last week.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

[Extract.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, December 30, 1862.

MY LORD: * * * * *

It is a fact that few persons in England will now be bold enough to deny, first, that vessels have been built in British ports, as well as manned by her Majesty's subjects, with the design and intent to carry on war against the United States; secondly, that other vessels owned by British subjects have been and are yet in the constant practice of departing from British ports, laden with contraband of war, and many other commodities, with the intent to break the blockade and to procrastinate the war; thirdly, that such vessels have been and are insured by British merchants in the commercial towns of this kingdom, with the understanding that they are dispatched for that illegal purpose. It is believed to be beyond denial that British subjects have been, and continue to be, enlisted in this kingdom in the service of the insurgents, with the intent to make war on the United States, or to break the blockade, legitimately established, and to a proportionate extent to annul its purpose. It is believed that persons high in social position and in fortune contribute their aid directly and indirectly, in building and equipping ships of war as well as other vessels, and furnishing money as well as goods with the hope of sustaining the insurgents in their resistance to the government. To that end the port of Nassau, a colonial dependency of Great Britain, has been made, and still continues to be, the great entrepôt for the storing of supplies which are conveyed from thence with the greater facility in evading the blockade. In short, so far as the acts of these numerous and influential parties can involve them, the British people may be considered as actually carrying on war against the United States. Already British property, valued at eight millions of pounds sterling, is reported to have been captured by the vessels of the United States, for attempts to violate the blockade, and property of far greater value has either been successfully introduced or is now stored at Nassau awaiting favorable opportunities.

If it be necessary to furnish to your lordship a clearer idea of the nature and extent of this warfare, it may, perhaps, be obtained by reference to the two papers marked A and B, which I have the honor to append to the present note. The one contains a list of screw steamers and sailing vessels which have been or still are engaged in this illegal commerce, furnished to me from observation by the consul of the United States at Liverpool. The other is a copy of a letter from the consul in London, giving a further list of vessels, together with some particulars as to the mode by which, and the persons by whom, this hostile system is carried on. Neither of these lists can be regarded as complete, but the two are sufficiently so for the present purpose, which is to place beyond contradiction the fact of the extensive and systematic prosecution by British subjects of a policy towards the United States which is uniformly characterized by writers on international law as that of an enemy.

I pray your lordship to accept the assurances of the distinguished consideration with which I have the honor to be, my lord, your most obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

A.

List of vessels, from the United States consul at Liverpool, which have either sailed from Great Britain and Ireland since the 1st of August last, or are now in course of preparation to sail, with contraband of war, for the purpose of breaking the blockade of the rebel ports.

STEAMERS.—Bahama, from Liverpool on the 13th August, with men and cannon; Bonita, (late the Economist,) Iona, Pearl, Kelpie, Giraffe, Antona, Calypso, Havelock, Nicolai I, Julie Usher, (late Annie Childs,) Stanley, Albion, Donbigh, Pet, Neptune, Sheldrake, Gypsey Queen, Cornubia, Eagle, Ruby, Florida, Juno, Thistle, Northumbria, Douglas, Britannia, Royal Bride, Douro, Beacon, Georgiana, Prince Albert, Leipsig.

SAILING VESSELS.—Ellen, Agrippina, (sailed from Cardiff, October 10, with shot, shell, and coal. This is the vessel that carried arms and coal from London to the No. 290 at Terceira. See depositions of Redden and King.) Severn, Queen of the Usk, Digby, Clarence, Mary Frances, Chatham, Peep o'Day, Speculation, Monmouth, Intrinsic.

B.

Mr. Morse to Mr. Adams.

UNITED STATES CONSULATE,
London, December 24, 1862.

SIR: In compliance with your request, I herewith forward a list comprising most of such steamers and sailing vessels as are known to me to have left the port of London laden with supplies for the insurgents now in rebellion against the United States.

I do not pretend that all the vessels which have left this port in the confederate service are known to me, but believe the following list of vessels can be relied on as being a part of those which have left with supplies, principally contraband of war, with the intention of either running the blockade directly, or of going to a neighboring Atlantic or Gulf port, and there discharging their cargoes into another class of vessels, the more easily to get such cargoes to their places of destination.

Vessels known to have left London.

Name.	Tonnage.	Time of departure.	Loaded by —
Steamship Gladstator	481	—, 1861	
Steamship Economist	338	Jan. 9, 1862	
Steamship Southwick	467	Jan. 24, 1862	
Steamship Minna	615	Feb. 28, 1862	
Steamship Phoebe	416	April 23, 1862	
Steamship Lloyds	743	April 11, 1862	W. S. Lindsay & Co.
Side-wheel steamer Merrimack	537	April 12, 1862	
Side-wheel steamer Pacific	932	Feb. 22, 1862	
Side-wheel steamer Melita	233	April 29, 1862	
Side-wheel steamer Ann	200	April 29, 1862	
Steamship Harriet	571	July 29, 1862	
Steamship Justitia	616	Oct. 20, 1862	
Steamship Recliel	—	Dec. —, 1861	W. S. Lindsay & Co.
Sailing ship Aries	217	—	
Steamship Flora	—	Dec. —, 1861	W. S. Lindsay & Co.
Steamship Princess Royal	—	Dec. —, 1861	W. S. Lindsay & Co.
Steamship Memphis	—	—	
Steamship Minho	—	—	
Steamship Wave Queen	—	—	
Steamship Peterhoff	—	—	Now loading for Matamorras.
Steamship Melita	853	—	Now loading for Havana.
Sailing ship Springbock	—	—	

The tonnage given is the net tonnage, or the carrying space of the vessel, the space taken up by machinery, &c., being deducted.

The screw steamer *Fingal* left Greenock in the summer of 1861. Her cargo was sent there to her by the steamer *Colletis*, from London.

Vessels which have left ports on the east coast of England, and which may not have been reported by any other consul: Circassian, Modern Greece, Stettin, Bahama, and Bermuda, from Hartlepool; Hero, Pataras, Labuan, Sidney Hall, and Tubal Cain, all screw steamers; and Brig Stephen Hart.

During the last six or eight weeks there have been great exertions made in this country to procure good, fast steamers, and to forward them, laden with supplies to the insurgents, to the ports of the rebel States, or to ports adjacent to the coast of those States. Many of the boats in this service have been purchased on the river Clyde. Three new ones, destined for the same service, have recently been launched there, and have not yet gone to sea. They have been named *Emma*, *Gertrude*, and *Louisiana*; and several more are building there.

The ownership of these steamers, the cargoes they carry out, and the manner of conducting the trade, is a question of much interest to Americans. During the early stages of the war the trade was carried on principally by agents sent over from the Confederate States, aided by a few mercantile houses and active sympathizers in this country. These agents, with their friends here, purchased the supplies, and procured steamers, mostly by charter, and forwarded the goods.

But by far the largest portion of the trade, with perhaps the exception of that in small-arms, is *now*, and for a long time has been, under the management and control of British merchants. It is carried on principally by British capital, in British ships, and crosses the Atlantic under the protection of the British flag.

Parties come from Richmond with contracts made with the rebel government by which they are to receive a very large percentage above the cost in confederate ports of the articles specified. British merchants become interested in these contracts, and participate in their profits or loss. I have seen the particulars of one such contract drawn out in detail, and have heard of others.

There are good reasons for believing that a large portion of the supplies more recently sent to the aid of the insurgents has been sent by merchants on their own account. Several will join together to charter a steamer and make up a cargo independent of all contractors, each investing as much in the enterprise as he may deem expedient, according to his zeal in the rebel cause, or his hope of realizing profit from the speculation.

Again: some one will put up a steamer to carry cargo to a rebel port at an enormous rate of freight, or to ports on the Atlantic or Gulf coast, such as Bermuda, Nassau, Havana, Matamoras, &c., at a less freight, to be from there reshipped to such southern ports as appears to afford the best opportunities for gaining an entrance. Ships bound on these voyages are, of course, not advertised, or their destination made known to the public. Their cargoes are made up of individual shipments, on account and risk of the shippers, or go into a joint stock concern, on account and risk of the company, each member thereof realizing profit or suffering loss in proportion to the amount he invested in the adventure. Both steamers and cargoes are often, if not generally, insured in England "to go to America with *liberty to run the blockade*."

Some individuals and mercantile firms appear to have entered into the business of supplying the rebels with the means of carrying on and

prolonging the war with great zeal and energy on their own account. Mr. Z. O. Pearsons, of Hull, has been largely interested in this contraband trade, but appears not to have been very fortunate in its pursuit, for he has had several valuable steamers taken by our blockading squadrons, and, in addition to this bad luck, appears to have received in payment for the goods he did get in a kind of paper or payment that could not be made available here.

Of the firms which are the most largely engaged in this mode of rendering aid to and sustaining the rebellion, Fraser, Trenholm & Co., of Liverpool, and the firm of W. S. Lindsay & Co., of London, are among the more prominent.

The foregoing list of vessels, steam and sailing, was taken from memorandums. Had my other duties allowed me time to examine my dispatches for the last year and a half, I could no doubt add others to the list, and give you some interesting particulars concerning many of them. But for want of that time I am obliged to submit it, imperfect as I fear it is.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

F. H. MORSE, *Consul.*

Hon. O. F. ADAMS,
United States Minister at London.

Mr. Dudley to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 1.]

UNITED STATES CONSULATE,
Liverpool, January 2, 1863.

SIR: I have referred frequently to the large number of steamers which of late have been purchased here in this country to run the blockade, and carry arms, ammunition, and supplies to the rebels in the South. It may not be amiss for me to recapitulate the names of such as have come to my knowledge. They are as follows: The Iona, Pearl, Thistle, Hornet, Antonia, Giraffe, Eagle, Havelock, Princess Royal, Sultan, Northumbria, Nicolai First, Douglas, Ruby, Britannia, Justicia, Wave Queen, Calypso, Albion, Douro, Denbigh, Flora, Beacon, Kelpie, Sheldrake, Leipsig, Pet, Georgiana, Neptune, Vulcan, Dolphin, Granite City, (late Dundee,) Peter Beys, Alliance, and Miriam, and the new steel steamer, called the Banshee, built here at Liverpool. Of these the Iona, Pearl, Thistle, Hornet, Antonia, Giraffe, Eagle, Havelock, Princess Royal, Northumbria, Nicolai First, Douglas, Ruby, Justicia, Wave Queen, Calypso, Douro, Flora, Kelpie, Sheldrake, and Granite City, have been loaded and sailed. Two, the Iona and Kelpie, were sunk after sailing. The others are loading, or else undergoing repairs at different ports preparatory to loading.

In addition to the above, there are other steamers which have been engaged in this business for some time past. Among them are the Herald, now called the Antonia; Julie Usher, Dispatch, Stanley, Gladiator, Bonita, late Economist, Bahama, Pacific, Nero, Modern Greece, Southwick, Lloyds, Minna, Cleopatra, Khersonese, Leopard, Merrimac, Peterhoff, Melita, Cornubia, Phœba, and H. Pinkney. (I do not include those which have been captured.) Of the last named, the Gladiator, Julie Usher, and Cornubia have recently sailed with valuable cargoes; the Minna is loading, and the Bahama, Bonita, and Stanley are ready to load at

Liverpool. The Peterhoff and Melita are at London, if they have not already sailed.

I do not suppose the above comprises all the steamers that have been purchased, and now engaged in this business. I only give the names of such as have come under my observation. The whole of the above are English, have British registers, owned or held by British subjects, generally manned entirely by British officers and seamen, and all sailing under the English flag.

The sailing vessels belonging to Great Britain or the subjects engaged in carrying aid and supplies to the rebels are more numerous than the steamers. Many of these land their cargoes at Nassau, Bermuda, Havana, St. Thomas, and Matamoras, while others run the blockade. I shall not attempt to give their names.

It is estimated that there is now at Nassau, Bermuda, Havana, and St. Thomas, and on the way there, not less than twenty millions sterling of arms and supplies ready to be run into the South. Since the first of March last, twenty-five hundred tons of gunpowder have been shipped from England for the insurgents. I would not pretend to enumerate the amount or quantity of arms and supplies that have been sent during the same period, but they are immense. A large quantity have been run into Charleston and other southern ports.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

THOMAS H. DUDLEY.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Dudley to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 136.]

UNITED STATES CONSULATE,
Liverpool, August 25, 1863.

SIR:

I beg to call your attention to a slip cut from the Journal of Commerce of yesterday, contained in inclosure No. 1, stating that the confederates are daily receiving immense amounts of supplies by Wilmington, and that officers and crews are constantly leaving for England to man the confederate privateers building there for the rebel navy, &c.

I am, sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

THOMAS H. DUDLEY.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

[From the Journal of Commerce, August 24, 1863.]

THE BLOCKADE OF WILMINGTON.

Letters received at New York from Wilmington state that the confederates are daily receiving an immense amount of supplies into that port in spite of the blockade. Machinery of all kinds, locomotives, railroad iron, guns of the heaviest caliber, blankets, medicines, shoes, and

everything which they require, are daily brought in by the cargo, as if no blockade existed at all. It is further stated that officers and crews are constantly leaving Wilmington for England, to man the confederate privateers which it is alleged are being built there for the rebel navy.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 736.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, October 17, 1863.

SIR: I inclose a copy of a letter, of the 13th instant, addressed to this department by the Secretary of the Navy, and of the contract to which it refers between certain agents of the insurgents for the delivery of naval stores at St. George's, Bermuda, to be thence introduced into the United States in violation of the blockade.

You will bring this to the notice of Earl Russell as a measure which, if carried into effect, seems to us to be a violation of the spirit, at least, of the Queen's proclamation, and as requiring such instructions to the authorities in Bermuda as would prevent those islands being made a place of deposit for the purpose referred to.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Welles to Mr. Seward.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, October 13, 1863.

SIR: I have the honor to inclose herewith a copy of an original contract in the possession of this department, entered into on the 28th of August, 1863, at Richmond, Va., between George R. Ghiseling, of Kentucky, and John H. Maddox, of Louisiana, under the name and style of George R. Ghiseling & Co., of the first part, and John de Bree, paymaster of the so-called confederate navy, for and in behalf of the navy department of the so-called Confederate States, of the second part, having for its object the procuring from abroad, for the use of the insurgent government, certain naval forces, and looking to the establishment of a depot for such stores at the port of St. George's, Bermuda.

The schedule referred to in the contract, and forming a part of it, did not come into the possession of this department.

My object in furnishing you with this extraordinary paper is for the purpose of suggesting that the attention of Lord Lyons be called to the proposed violation of the neutrality of Great Britain by making use of one of her Majesty's ports as a depot of naval stores intended for the insurgent government, which has been recognized by Great Britain as a belligerent, and under a contract made under the authority of said government.

In connection with this contract, it may not be amiss to state that one of the parties to it, Joseph H. Maddox, was early in the rebellion confined as Fort Lafayette upon a charge of illicit traffic and violence of the blockade, and was released on entering into an engagement, under oath, that he would not enter any of the States in insurrection against the

authority of the government of the United States, nor hold any correspondence or other communication with persons residing therein, during the present hostilities, without permission, nor do any act hostile or injurious to the government of the United States.

Very, respectfully, &c.,

GIDEON WELLES,
Secretary of the Navy.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

[For the inclosed contract see dispatch No. 529 of Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward, dated November 4, 1863, *post.*]

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 529.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, November 4, 1863.

SIR: Dispatches from the department, numbered 735, 736, and 737, have been received this week at this legation.

In obedience to the directions contained in No. 736 of the 17th of October, I addressed a note to Lord Russell on the subject of the intercepted contract, a copy of which was received with that dispatch. A copy of my note is herewith transmitted.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, November 3, 1863.

MY LORD: I have great regret in being obliged to lay before your lordship new proofs of the manner in which the neutrality of her Majesty's ports is abused by the insurgents in the United States in order the more effectually to procrastinate their resistance.

I have the honor to transmit the copy of a letter addressed to the Secretary of State by the Secretary of the Navy of the United States, dated the 13th day of October, together with a copy of a contract entered into between certain parties and an agent of the insurgents, the original being now in the possession of the government, one of the objects designated in which is the establishing in the port of St. George's, in the island of Bermuda, of a depot of naval stores for their use and benefit in the prosecution of the war.

This proceeding, if carried into effect, would seem to be so entirely in violation of the spirit, not less than the letter, of her Majesty's proclamation, that I am instructed to ask your attention to the expediency of giving such instructions to the authorities in Bermuda as would prevent its being made a place of deposit for the purpose referred to.

I pray your lordship to accept the assurances of the highest consid-

eration with which I have the honor to be, my lord, your most obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCOIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

[For letter of the Secretary of the Navy see dispatch from Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams, No. 736, October 17, 1863, *ante*.]

Copy of contract.

This contract, made and entered into this 28th day of September, A. D. 1863, between George R. Ghiseling, of Kentucky, and Joseph H. Maddox, of Louisiana, under the name and style of George R. Ghiseling & Co., of the first part, and John de Bree, paymaster confederate navy, for and in behalf of the navy department of the Confederate States, witnesseth: That the said party of the first part undertakes and agrees to deliver to the designated agent of the Confederate States navy department, at a port of the Confederate States east of the mouth of the Mississippi River, in the possession and control of the Confederate States government, within six (6) months from the first (1st) day of October, 1862, all in good merchantable order, the naval stores as set forth in the schedules hereto annexed, marked A, B, C, D, and E, respectively, which schedules are hereby declared to belong to and become part of this contract.

And said party of the first part further stipulates and agrees to purchase or otherwise procure one or more fast and light-draught steamers, and to freight and dispatch the same from some foreign port with all the haste possible; said steamers to remain under the exclusive control of said party of the first part during the continuance of this contract, and to be used only in its execution.

And it is understood and agreed that if at any time the said party of the second part shall so direct, any part or the whole of deliveries under said schedules A, B, C, D, and E, or under any other hereafter sent, shall be made at the port of St. George's, Bermuda, excepting such portions thereof as shall already have been actually shipped before the receipt of such order by the party of the first part.

And in consideration of the stipulations by the party of the first part, as hereinbefore set forth, the party of the second part covenants and agrees to pay to the party of the first part, his attorney or assigns, upon certified bills or invoices approved by the agent of the Confederate States at the port whence shipped, the full amount of each and every delivery, with the addition of twenty-five (25) per cent. thereon if delivered in a port of the Confederate States, and with an addition of ten (10) per cent. thereon if delivered at the port of St. George's, Bermuda, and with the addition, in either case, of the actual cost of transportation, to include the outlay for coal, hire, and subsistence of the crew and officers, wharfage, lightage, and labor of loading only: *Provided*, That, in the case of deliveries at a port of the Confederate States, such charges for transportation shall not exceed and may be covered by the payments to the party of the first part of twenty-five pounds (£25) sterling for each and every ton so delivered.

And the party of the second part further covenants and agrees to pay the party of the first part an additional premium of ten (10) per cent. upon all bills or invoices, certified to as above, if delivered at a port of

the Confederate States within forty (40) days from the tenth (10) day of October, 1863, there being no premium to be paid upon any charges for freight or transportation.

And the party of the first part agrees and stipulates to receive for all payments to be made to him, at the option of the Confederate States navy department, either sterling bills of exchange, or cotton at sixpence (6d.) sterling per pound, delivered at a port of the Confederate States in the possession and control of the Confederate States government: *Provided*, That said party of the first may be allowed to convert such bills of exchange into cotton, and to ship all cotton in either way obtained by them without any impressment of or interference with the same during its transportation to or detention at such port; and that it is distinctly understood and agreed that no part of said cotton shall be used for any other purpose than to purchase naval stores under this contract, until all the provisions of the same shall have been carried out and executed; and that no part of said cotton shall at any time be shipped to or sold in any port belonging to or in possession of the United States of America, under the penalty of forfeiture of all dues and payments to the said party of the first part by the Confederate States navy department.

And, finally, it is understood and agreed that all schedules that may be sent by the party of the second part after the signing of this contract shall become part of it, and be in full force for all the provisions of the same, from the date of their receipt by the party of the first part, and that this contract may be extended beyond the time hereinbefore set forth, both parties thereto concurring: *Provided, also*, That if, by the act of God or of the public enemy, there shall be any unavoidable delay or detention in the deliveries under this contract, the time hereinbefore stated shall be extended, so as to allow the party of the first part the time necessary to carry out the stipulations of the same.

In testimony whereof, we have hereunto set our hands this twenty-eighth day of September, A. D. 1863, at the navy department of the Confederate States of America.

GEORGE R. GHISELING.

J. H. MADDOX.

JOHN DE BREE, *Paymaster in charge*.

Signed, sealed, and delivered in presence of—

J. P. McCORKLE.

CHARLES J. OST.

Approved.

S. R. MALLORY, *Secretary of the Navy*.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 550.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, December 4, 1863.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit a copy of a note addressed by Lord Russell to me on the 27th ultimo, in reply to mine of the 3d of the same month, which was written in the sense of your dispatch No. 736, of the 17th of October. The ground taken seems to me technically defensible, though a promise of a little investigation, or at least close observation

47 A C—VOL. I

at St. George's, would have been more satisfactory than throwing the burden of proof entirely on us.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *November 27, 1863.*

SIR: Her Majesty's government have duly considered, in communication with the proper law advisers of the Crown, your letter of the 3d instant and its inclosures, respecting an alleged project for the establishment of a depot at St. George's, Bermuda, from which articles might be shipped to the ports of the so-styled Confederate States.

I have now the honor to state to you that it appears from the contract for this service, between Messrs. Ghiseling & Co. and Mr. J. de Bree, of which a copy is enclosed in your letter, that the parties to it are not British subjects, but Americans, over whom her Majesty's government have no authority or control; while the schedules referred to in it, not being annexed, the character of the stores which these persons contract for is not shown. These stores may or may not be of a contraband character, and even if they are, the terms of the contract seem only to contemplate the use of ordinary mercantile agency.

Moreover, the terms of the contract do not necessarily import the establishment of any depot in Bermuda, but rather point to transshipment in the port of Bermuda of naval stores from vessels arriving there from foreign ports; nor is this transshipment rendered necessary or obligatory by the contract, but is left optional or contingent, the words of the contract being, "If at any time the said party of the second part shall so direct any part or the whole of deliveries, under said schedules A, B, C, D, and E, or any other hereafter sent, shall be made at the port of St. George's, Bermuda."

Under these circumstances her Majesty's government do not consider that they can properly interfere in this matter; but should you be furnished with any further information tending to show any intention on the part of any persons to violate the neutrality of British territory, they will not fail to give to your representations their most careful attention.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 782.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 7, 1863.

SIR: Information has reached this department to the effect that a British naval officer, either retired or active, by the name of Ralph Cator, is engaged in running the blockade of the insurgent ports of the United

States, under the assumed name of Peterson. There is reason also to believe that other British officers are thus engaged.

I will thank you to bring this subject under the consideration of her Majesty's secretary of state for foreign affairs, to make inquiry in regard to the person above named. It is not doubted that her Majesty's government will visit with its displeasure any of its officers who may have been guilty of such an offense.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 566.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, January 1, 1864.

In obedience to the directions contained in your dispatch (No. 782) of the 7th of December, I addressed a note to Lord Russell on the 29th ultimo in relation to the conduct of Ralph Cator. Copies of that note and of his lordship's acknowledgement are herewith transmitted.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, December 29, 1863.

MY LORD: I am directed by my government to represent to you that information entitled to credit has been received by it to the effect that an officer in her Majesty's naval service, either retired or active, by the name of Ralph Cator, is engaged in violating the blockade of the insurgent ports of the United States, under the assumed name of Peterson. I am further instructed to express the belief that other British naval officers are thus engaged.

In view of this information, corroborated by the late proceedings at Sheerness, I am reluctantly compelled to believe that there is a strong disposition on the part of a portion of her Majesty's navy to violate the neutrality of their sovereign in aiding and assisting the enemies of the United States in the resistance they are making to the lawful government. I am requested to solicit your lordship's attention to the expediency of making inquiry in regard to the alleged proceedings of the person above named, not doubting that should he prove to be guilty her Majesty's government will visit the offence he has committed with its displeasure.

I beg to renew the assurances of the highest consideration with which I have the honor to be, my lord, your most obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *December 30, 1863.*

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 29th instant, relative to a British naval officer of the name of Ralph Cator, who is stated to be engaged, with others, in violating the blockade of the southern ports of North America, and I have to acquaint you, in reply, that I have caused your letter to be communicated to the proper department of her Majesty's government.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 570.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, January 8, 1864.

SIR: I have now to report the reception of another note from Lord Russell in relation to the case of Ralph Cator, already acted upon, as mentioned by me in my despatch (No. 566) of last week.

A copy of his lordship's note is transmitted.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *January 6, 1864.*

SIR: With reference to my letter of the 30th ultimo, I have the honor to inform you that I have received from the board of admiralty a letter stating that in all cases in which they have received applications from officers on half pay for leave to proceed to the West Indies, the board have refused such leave whenever there has been any suspicion that the officer intended to sail in any ship engaged in running the blockade of the southern ports.

The admiralty further state that on the 25th of May last leave to go to Jamaica, on family affairs, for six months, was granted to Commander Ralph P. Cator, and that within the time specified he reported his return to this country. Commander Cator, whilst on leave, was on the half-pay list of his rank. The board add that if it should be made clear to them that Commander Cator has been employed as alleged by you, the indulgence of leave will be in future refused to him.

As regards your statement that you believe that other British naval officers are engaged in violating the blockade, the lords of the admiralty observed that they have not received any information which leads them to believe that any other officers of her Majesty's navy, either on the active or reserved lists, are so engaged.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant.

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 806.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 11, 1864.

SIR: I transmit copies of certain letters which were found on board the prize steamers *R. E. Lee* and *Cornubia*, and which conclusively show that the British vessels now engaged in attempted violations of the blockade are not neutral vessels, but are really rebel transports, fraudulently dispatched and sailing under the British flag. You will have the goodness to place copies of these papers in the hands of Earl Russell. The originals are on file in the office of the clerk of the United States district court of Massachusetts.

You will submit to Earl Russell the inquiry, whether the developments thus brought to his knowledge do not require some modification of the policy hitherto maintained by her Majesty's government in regard to the political controversy which this government is so diligently engaged in endeavoring to bring to an end, favorable to the interests of both countries and to the cause of humanity. At least her Majesty's government cannot be surprised that, with the knowledge now possessed by this government, the policy hitherto pursued by the United States in regard to assaults of the blockade will be modified.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[For inclosures see dispatch from Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward, No. 584, dated January 28, 1864, *post.*]

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 810.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 12, 1864.

SIR: I have received, and have submitted to the President, your dispatch of December 4, No. 550, which is accompanied by a copy of a note addressed to you by Earl Russell, in reply to the representations you have made concerning a contract by insurgents with British subjects, in which Bermuda was designated as a place for the receipt of contraband merchandise, to be shipped to the insurgents.

While I admit that the evidence, to which reference is made, is attended by the uncertainty and want of directness which his lordship indicates, I cannot but think that it is sufficient to justify the United States in expecting her Majesty's government to institute precautionary measures against the execution of a purpose, in the island of Bermuda, so manifestly injurious to this country, and derogating from the impartial neutrality which Great Britain has proclaimed. It is hardly to be expected that the United States could procure direct and conclusive evidences of frauds and combinations plotted by its enemies living under the protection of British laws.

I shall continue to furnish you with such circumstantial proofs upon the point involved as fall into my hands. Of this class is the accompanying extract from the *Morning Telegraph*, a newspaper printed at St. John's, New Brunswick, on the 5th instant.

Of the same class is the fact that Lieutenant Rooke, of her Majesty's

army, was detected carrying a contraband mail to Bermuda, to be delivered to insurgent agents there.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Letter from Halifax.

[Special correspondence of the Morning Telegraph.]

HALIFAX, December 31.

The Bermuda packet, arrived to-day, brings absolutely nothing of interest from the Confederate States. There are two passengers through from Wilmington, 12th instant. I have one solitary paper of that date. The *Flora* is the only blockade steamer out since the last moon, a month ago. One schooner came through from Wilmington successfully, and another schooner had got in. The *Don* and *Hansa* had been captured by the federals off Charleston, and the *Beauregard* and *Ceres* run ashore near Wilmington and destroyed. The *Ceres* is the only steamer of all blockade runners that has not paid for herself; it was her first trip. The *Beauregard* had a very valuable cargo. Steamers continue to arrive at Nassau and Bermuda, to take the places of those destroyed. The number is increased rather than diminished. This business is reduced to a mathematical nicety, and the chances of profit and loss are fully computed. No vessel is expected to have nine lives, although a half dozen or so are reckoned upon.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 812.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, January 13, 1864.

SIR: With instructions No. 806, of the 11th instant, copies of letters found on board blockade runners condemned at Boston were transmitted. Those letters showed that many if not most of the vessels engaged in that business are owned in whole or in part by the insurgent authorities, and, consequently, that as the British flag which they usually fly is prostituted, they, their cargoes, and the persons on board of them, are liable to be treated as belligerents. Inclosed is a slip from a recent number of the *London Index*, acknowledging that the insurgent government has for the past year been in part, at least, interested in the cargoes of those vessels, and advising that in future it should increase that interest. The significance of these facts and of this counsel, for the purpose of counter-weighing impressions of exclusive or even partial interests of neutrals in the blockade runners, will be useful to you.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[From the New York Times, January 12, 1864.]

THE REBEL COTTON LOAN.

From the London Index, (rebel organ.)

During the year now closing, about 130,000 bales of cotton, of about 500 pounds weight each, have found their way through the blockade to European ports, which, at the ruling prices, sold for upwards of £8,000,000 sterling. With this fund to its credit, had the cotton been exported for its own account, instead of, for the most part, private speculators, the confederate government might have dispensed with foreign loans, might have bought its warlike stores at the lowest cash rates, and supplied its citizens with commodities of prime necessity at a moderate advance on cost. Not only would it have earned the fabulous profits pocketed by foreign merchants, but it would have saved itself the issue of that flood of promises to pay with which it purchased importations, and which the importers made haste to dispose of on any terms. And what creditor at home could have doubted the solvency of a debtor who was the largest holder of foreign exchange in the country?

Let it not be said that the government would have failed where private enterprise succeeded. The experiment has been sufficiently tried to demonstrate that the government in blockade ventures has been even more fortunate than individuals, probably for the reason that, thanks to the patriotic enthusiasm of the whole people, it is at present the best served government in the world. To its success in this respect is due the credit which, amid the most adverse circumstances, it still commands in the markets of Europe. The question, then, would simply have been to extend on a larger scale what has been done with considerable success on a small one. The mercantile marine of every country, not excepting that of the North, is open to it to select the stanchest and the swiftest vessels. It commands a staff of naval officers inferior to those of no country in skill, courage, and dash; and although the service may not be so brilliant and so much to their taste, at the country's bidding they would render it as zealously and as devotedly as though they trod the decks of Merrimacks and Alabamas. It will scarcely be contended that vessels avowedly the property of the confederate government would run greater risks on the high seas from the enemy's cruisers than those owned by British subjects run under the warm neutrality of the Foreign Office.

But if private enterprise must be called into aid, the cotton bonds now in the hands of European holders afford the desired machinery, provided all private exportation, except in redemption of these bonds, is prohibited. The £3,200,000 which the government now owes in Europe represents, at sixpence per pound, 260,000 bales of cotton, which, at the rate of this year's exportation, could be run through the blockade in about two years. Every obligation thus redeemed would make room for a new one, which, as the only means of purchasing cotton, would be eagerly sought at prices remunerative to the government. We are told that sound political economy forbids the granting of monopolies; but blockade-running is virtually already the monopoly of those firms which were the first and the most enterprising in the attempt. Why not, if a monopoly must exist, give it to those who have trusted the government? Besides, no one is injured thereby, for those who now hold this virtual monopoly may still retain it by merely changing their purchasing medium.

We have reasons to believe that in advocating this recommendation of Mr. McRae we express the convictions of nearly every important officer of the Confederate States in Europe, and of the great majority of the friends and well-wishers of the confederate cause. If anything approaching the same unanimity exists in the congress now assembled at Richmond—and there appears no cause to doubt it—we may expect by any steamer, within the next four or five weeks, to hear of the passage of an act laying an embargo on the exportation of cotton, under conditions similar to those here indicated.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 814.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 14, 1864.

SIR: I inclose an extract from a dispatch of the 17th ultimo (No. 96) from the United States consul at Malta, relative to reports that British naval officers, under assumed names, are engaged in violating the blockade of ports yet held by the insurgents. The same information reaches us from other quarters. Although it is possibly exaggerated, it would be well for you to suggest whether an inquiry could not be made into the matter.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Winthrop to Mr. F. W. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 96.]

UNITED STATES CONSULATE,
Malta, December 17, 1863.

1. SIR: I would beg to inform you of my having recently received reliable information that many English naval officers on half pay and under assumed names are now engaged in running the blockade.

2. May I beg to suggest that hereafter when any prizes are taken that every officer and passenger should be made to identify himself, even if he had to send to England to do it. When discovered to be English officers, if their names were reported to the British government, they would lose their commissions and prevent others from running a similar risk in future.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

W. WINTHROP.

Hon. F. W. SEWARD,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 584.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, January 28, 1864.

SIR:

The other day when I had an interview with Lord Russell, * * *

I entered upon the line of argument with his lordship which you have marked out for me in several of your late dispatches, a large part but not all of which had been already embraced in my note to him of the 19th, a copy of which was sent to you with my No. 579, of the 21st instant, and is repeated in a note specially based upon your dispatch No. 806, of the 11th of this month, a copy of which will accompany this. I alluded to the critical state in which the reciprocity treaty might be put by the omission satisfactorily to dispose of these multiplying causes of difficulty on the boundary, enlarged upon the aggravated nature of the violations habitually and audaciously committed by the rebels against the neutrality of Great Britain, and urged the expediency of some positive action in advance of any possible settlement of the differences in America, which might serve to rectify any popular impression that may have been made as to the proclivities of England during this war.

The conversation which followed was scarcely official on either side.

His lordship led me to infer that he had himself been so much impressed with the expediency of doing something that he had proposed to the members of the cabinet to send an armed vessel to the confederate authorities, with an officer instructed to remonstrate, but they had not thought it best to sanction the measure. From this it would appear that the obstacle to action does not lie with him.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, January 25, 1864.

MY LORD: I have the honor to present to your consideration copies of certain papers taken in steamers engaged in violating the blockade, the originals of which are on file in the district court of the United States for Massachusetts.

It would appear that this evidence furnishes another strong instance of the manner in which the insurgents habitually abuse the belligerent privileges which have been conceded to them by Great Britain. With the manifest design to protect British subjects who navigate the ships and cargoes purchased by them in this kingdom, and intended to violate the blockade, they give particular directions, forbidding any sign to be made on board or in foreign ports of their ownership. The facilities and privileges these vessels now enjoy by the use of the British flag are, it would seem, not to be curtailed; however, the reputation of her Majesty's government, as earnestly desiring to maintain neutrality, may be implicated by the fraud.

It must be obvious to your lordship that, after such an exposition, all British subjects engaged in these violations of blockade must incur a suspicion strong enough to make them liable to be treated as enemies, and if taken, to be reckoned as prisoners of war. If the flag of the kingdom be fraudulently used to cover the enterprises of the enemy, it will become very difficult to distinguish between those persons actually engaged in their vessels and those *bona fide* employed by British owners. A new form of severity may thus be given to the struggle which would

be regretted by none more than by my government. Much as the difficulty of their task has been aggravated by the wanton and persistent interposition of British subjects, it has never been their disposition to treat them, when in their power, with unnecessary harshness.

I am pained, in this connection, to be obliged to call your lordship's attention to the fact that Lieutenant Rooke, of her Majesty's army, after being taken in a steamer running the blockade, and released, has been detected in attempting to carry a contraband mail to Bermuda, to be delivered to insurgent agents at that place.

After the conversation which I had the honor to hold with your lordship on Friday last, I deem it almost superfluous to enlarge further on the difficulties which must grow out of a toleration of the outrageous abuses of the belligerent privileges that have been granted to the insurgents, as they have been laid before you for your notice. It would be difficult to find an example in history of a more systematic and persistent effort to violate the neutral position of a country than this one has been from its commencement, that has not actually brought on a war. That this has been the object of the parties engaged in it, I have never for a moment doubted. Wearied, exhausted, and discouraged, as they notoriously are at this time, they still relax no effort that may bring to them some hope of relief from this source, the only one left to them. I entertain the strongest hopes that the wisdom and prudence of both governments will persevere in searching for the best means of making this expectation as vain as have proved all the others thus far cherished by them.

It has been no part of my instructions to address any argument on this subject to your lordship, based purely upon the possible consequences of permitting any similar toleration of such notorious enterprises in a neutral country to be brought into a precedent in future cases between belligerents. The fact that it must place an instrument of enormous power in the hands of weak nations on the ocean to annoy the stronger ones is too apparent to need exposition. I know not that, viewed as a pure question of interest to the United States, whenever it may again become a neutral power, there would be much reason to object to it. The great and serious difficulty is, to all nations, that it furnishes incentives to a constant extension of the ravages of war on the ocean, equally to be deplored by all—an effort which it has been, of late years, the earnest desire of all to endeavor to restrict rather than to expand.

I pray your lordship to accept the assurances of the highest consideration with which I have the honor to be, my lord, your most obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Dana to Mr. Seward.

OFFICE OF UNITED STATES ATTORNEY,
District of Massachusetts, Boston, December 28, 1863.

SIR: I have the honor to enclose herewith copies of letters found on board the prize steamers R. E. Lee and Cornubia, which I thought might be useful to you as proofs in cases of alleged building and equipping of vessels for the rebel government in England.

The originals are on file in court, and, if needed, can be sent to our minister in England.

Letters found on board show that the R. E. Lee, Cornubia, and Ella and Anna, and others of their class, are the property of the confederate government, commanded by commissioned officers; and I inclose a copy of a letter, showing that they are instructed to conceal their true character in neutral ports, in order to avoid the rules applied to public vessels of belligerents.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

RICHARD H. DANA, JR.,
United States Attorney.

HON. WM. H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Messrs. Alexander Collie & Brother to Captain J. Wilkinson.

MANCHESTER, November 14, 1862.

DEAR SIR: In the event of the Giraffe being sent back to England with cotton or other produce, we will be very glad to take charge of her and to dispose of the cargo on account of the confederate government; and if a further supply of boats or other articles be required from this country, we place our services in the purchase and shipping of those goods at the disposal of the government. The experience we have gained of the wants of the army and navy, and the knowledge we have of the qualities of the various articles required for their use, fit us, we believe, to execute such orders in a manner which will be in every way satisfactory. Wishing you a pleasant and a successful voyage,

We are, dear sir, yours, very faithfully,

ALEXANDER COLLIE & BRO.

Captain J. WILKINSON,
Confederate States Navy.

The above is a copy of a letter found on board the prize steamer R. E. Lee, of which Wilkinson was commander at the time.

R. H. DANA, JR., *U. S. Attorney.*

Mr. I. Gorgas to Captain Commanding Cornubia.

[Cornubia.—Circular.]

CONFEDERATE STATES OF AMERICA,
War Department, Ordnance Office, Richmond, September 25, 1863.

SIR: For special reasons it is deemed advisable that our steamers engaged in running the blockade should not carry pennants or other insignia of vessels of war. You are requested, when in foreign ports, to carefully guard against all acts tending in any manner to cause issuance of orders by the authorities curtailing the facilities and privileges our vessels now enjoy. Your conduct should be such as to leave the impression that your steamer does not belong to the government, but is simply used by it as a carrier.

Your obedient servant,

I. GORGAS,
Colonel and Chief of Ordnance.

To CAPTAIN *Commanding Cornubia.*

Original found on board the prize steamer Cornubia.

R. H. DANA, JR., *U. S. Attorney.*

Mr. James Ash to Edgar Stringer, Esq.

CUBITT TOWN, LONDON, *October 2, 1863.*

DEAR SIR: In answer to your inquiry, whether the contract I now send you in will be in force for three months from the 25th October, 1863, I beg leave to say it will, and that I am prepared to build three steamers of same dimensions at the same price, to be delivered you ready for furnishing for sea at the expiration of four months from the date of my receiving deposit installment from you.

In handing you the model for the construction of the navy in Richmond, I shall, of course, be fully prepared to adopt any suggestions he may make, and to alter the boat according.

The price which you paid me for the steamers now building, particularly the Nutfield, is dearer, considering that she is of less horse-power than the offer I am now making you, as well as being larger; and you must also take into consideration that I am binding myself for three months hence, which I would not do except for the desire I have of doing more business for you.

I am, dear sir, yours faithfully,

JAMES ASH, *Iron Shipbuilder.*

EDGAR STRINGER, Esq.

Original found on board the prize steamer Cornubia.

R. H. DANA, JR., *U S. Attorney.*

Mr. John S. Seward to Messrs. Stringer, Pembroke & Co.

BLACKWELL IRON WORKS,

London, October 3, 1853.

GENTLEMEN: I will undertake to supply you with marine screw engines for line-of-battle ships or rams, from two hundred horse-power to four hundred horse-power, for the sum of forty-eight pounds ten shillings per hundred pounds, to be made of the best material and workmanship; all the pipes to be copper; engine bearings moving in the best gun metal or white metal if approved, to be furnished to the entire satisfaction of any person the mercantile marine company or yourselves may appoint; and I also agree to make the engines from plans and specifications to be sent home from the confederate government's engineer, and to be finished in six or eight months from date of order. I also agree to send out men, if required, to place the engines in the respective ships, at the confederate government's expense.

I am, gentlemen, yours truly,

JNO. S. SEWARD.

Messrs. STRINGER, PEMBROKE & Co., *Austin Friars.*

Original found on board the prize steamer Cornubia.

R. H. DANA, JR., *Attorney.*

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 590.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,

London, February 4, 1864.

SIR: Dispatches numbered from 812 to 819, inclusive, have been received at this legation.

In regard to the views taken in your dispatch No. 812, of the 13th of January, I had already in my note to Lord Russell of the 25th ultimo, a copy of which was sent to you last week, apprised him of the probable effect, on British subjects attempting to run the blockade, of the latest trick resorted to by the rebels. A copy of his lordship's acknowledgment, dated the 1st instant, is herewith transmitted.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *February 1, 1864.*

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 25th ultimo, inclosing copies of papers taken in steamers engaged in running the blockade of the southern ports; and I have the honor to inform you that the matter to which your letter refers shall be considered by her Majesty's government.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 621.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, March 18, 1864.

SIR: In connection with your dispatch, No. 806, of the 11th of January last, and mine numbered 584, of the 28th of the same month, and 590, of the 4th of February, I now transmit copies of a later note of Lord Russell, dated the 9th instant, on the same subject, and of my reply on the 15th.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *March 9, 1864.*

SIR: With reference to my letter of the 1st ultimo, I have now the honor to reply to your letter of the 20th of January, in which you inclose copies of papers which have come into the possession of the United States government, purporting to show that ships and cargoes intended to run the blockade have been purchased in this country on account of the so-styled confederate government. You state that this evidence furnishes another strong instance of the manner in which the insurgents

habitually abuse the belligerent privileges which have been conceded to them by this country; and you say, that after such an exposure, all British subjects engaged in these violations of blockade must incur a suspicion strong enough to make them liable to be treated as enemies, and, if taken, to be reckoned as prisoners of war.

To this declaration her Majesty's government must reply that they are not prepared, on account of the exigencies or distresses of either belligerent, to assent to the introduction, to the injury of neutral states, of any alteration in the well-established practice of international law.

You are no doubt aware, as every American jurist must be aware, that it is not competent to a belligerent government to treat as prisoners of war the subjects of neutral states taken on board vessels (not being ships of war of the enemy) endeavoring, or alleged to be endeavoring, to break the blockade, and it would be impossible for her Majesty's government to permit British subjects to be made exceptions to the general rules and practice of international law on this or any other subject.

I need scarcely remind you that the rights of visit and search and of blockade are belligerent rights which press with sufficient severity upon neutrals, and which, as her Majesty's government have already had occasion to observe in their correspondence with the United States government during the war, would be intolerable without a faithful and scrupulous observance, on the part of the belligerent, of his corresponding obligations.

It is obvious that her Majesty's government can in no way be responsible for the conduct of the confederate belligerent; and with reference to your statement that the confederates habitually abuse the privileges which have been conceded to them by Great Britain, I must beg leave to remind you that not only Great Britain, but every other neutral state, has of necessity recognized the confederates as belligerents, and has, therefore, of necessity conceded to them, not indeed "privileges," but the same "rights" which a neutral state is bound by international law to concede to all belligerents, and which Great Britain has conceded in the present war to the United States.

Her Majesty's government have, on previous occasions, expressed their regret that any of her Majesty's subjects should violate the blockade, and I repeat that regret most unreservedly on the present occasion; but it must be remembered that the blockade is one of most unusual proportions; that it severely affects the welfare of no inconsiderable portion of her Majesty's subjects, and that the penalty of confiscation and condemnation of British property, to a very large amount, has constituted, to say the least, no very inadequate punishment of the offenders. At all events you will hardly deny that, whether that punishment is or is not adequate, in the opinion of the government of the United States, it is the only penalty to which such offenders can, according to the well-known rules of international law, be made liable. If the fact be, as the papers inclosed in your note seem to show, that some ships engaged in running the blockade, but not navigated as vessels of war, are the property of the government of the Confederate States, this fact cannot, in the judgment of her Majesty's government, furnish any justification whatever for the treatment of British subjects in a manner not warranted by international law, even if the British flag should be improperly used to disguise the character of such vessels.

If, indeed, British subjects were found on board vessels belonging to the confederate government, and were not merely passengers, but were employed in connection with the vessel and cargo in circumstances which rendered it practically impossible that they should be ignorant of the

ownership of the vessels, her Majesty's government do not say that there might not be a *prima facie* ground for treating such persons as prisoners of war; but the case now in controversy is that of British subjects engaged as seamen on board of vessels ostensibly British, and which they have had every reason to suppose to be really and *bona fide* such; and her Majesty's government must insist that the United States government would be without warrant in treating such persons as enemies merely on the ground of the discovery, and more on the mere suspicion, without any proof applicable to the particular case, of a concealed interest of the confederate government in such vessel.

With respect to the charge preferred against Lieutenant Rooke, her Majesty's government fail to perceive that the facts alleged would have amounted to a participation by that officer in any warlike service or operation on the part of the Confederate States. Her Majesty's government will not fail to take the proper steps against any officer, bearing her Majesty's commission, who shall be proved to have illegally contravened her Majesty's orders to all her subjects to observe a strict neutrality during the present deplorable war; but in Lieutenant Rooke's case it does not appear that, on further inquiry, the United States authorities were disposed to view the proceedings of that young officer as anything more than the result of inconsiderate thoughtlessness, and I was happy to learn, by a recent mail, that Lieutenant Rooke had been released from confinement.

I shall only further observe, with reference to the alleged intentions of a certain iron-ship builder named James Ash, and of a firm called Stringer, Pembroke & Co., to build steamers for the confederate belligerents, that you must be well aware of the determination of her Majesty's government to put in force, to the utmost of their power, the provisions of the foreign enlistment act against every British subject who shall violate those provisions, and as to whose offence her Majesty's government may be able to obtain legal and proper evidence, but without such evidence it is impossible for her Majesty's government to act against the persons or property of British subjects.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, March 15, 1864.

MY LORD: I have the honor to acknowledge the reception of your lordship's note of the 9th instant, in reply to mine of the 20th of January last. I have read it with great attention, and must beg your lordship's pardon if I fail to find in it any substantial conflict with the principles enunciated in my letter.

The point to which I took the liberty of calling your lordship's attention was, that the insurgent authorities at Richmond, having received from her Majesty's government a recognition as a belligerent carrying on war upon the ocean with a power with which Great Britain is at peace, are now detected in an attempt to abuse the rights so obtained. To this end they systematically buy vessels of British subjects, man them with British seamen, fill them with supplies and munitions of war

obtained in British ports, and persist in sailing them to their respective destinations in the blockaded region, using the protection of the British flag. My government having been made aware of these extraordinary proceedings, has directed me simply to apprise your lordship of them in order that some check may be applied by the party most interested for the better security of its innocent subjects; for it must be perfectly obvious to your lordship that, without interference of some kind, the duty of self-defense, against such a policy of disguised hostility, becomes imperative. Without the possibility of distinguishing between those vessels *bona fide* owned by British subjects, intending to violate the blockade, and those made exactly to resemble them by the insurgents for the purpose of better carrying on their warfare, it must be apparent that all must be equally liable to incur the suspicion of being actual enemies, and their crews *prima facie* to be treated as such on capture.

I understand your lordship not to deny, that to the extent that British subjects may be found in the vessels of the enemy, knowing them to be so, and employed in circumstances which render it practically impossible that they should be ignorant of the work they are doing, the right to treat them as prisoners of war, in case of capture, is a valid right. But if this be once admitted, it necessarily follows that in all cases where suspicion of actually belonging to the enemy attaches to a vessel under certain circumstances, though disguised under British colors, the right of search and seizure is a matter of course. And if it should happen that on board of a vessel so seized are to be found numbers of British subjects, apparently engaged in a work in which it is well known that many of their fellow-subjects are actually enlisted elsewhere, it must be obvious to your lordship that they will not be able, by any care that may be exercised by the captors, wholly to escape the risk of unpleasant consequences that may attend the difficulty of distinguishing between the partially innocent neutral and the wholly guilty enemy.

That I may more clearly present my argument I pray permission to illustrate it by a single example, which has lately been brought to my notice. It has been stated to me, on authority which appears to be trustworthy, that a British subject, named Thomas J. Waters, started from Greenlieth on or about the 17th of January last, in command of a steamer called the *Annie*, apparently fitted out for ulterior designs in America. After getting as far as Portland a heavy blow compelled him to put back, on the 19th or 20th, to Southampton, from whence he sailed again a few days after. Just before leaving London this gentleman is stated to have applied to be, and to have been, actually gazetted as a lieutenant in the naval reserve. The object in making such an application at the precise moment could scarcely have been other than in case of difficulty to take advantage of the national uniform and flag to protect his ulterior hostile operations against a foreign nation. Whether Lieutenant Waters be or be not acting under the authority of the insurgents at Richmond, it is obviously impossible now to determine. The true facts could only be elicited in case of the capture of him and his vessel. In the meantime it must be obvious to your lordship that, under present circumstances, the flagrant abuse thus committed of the position he holds as a British officer would almost necessarily subject him, in the first instance, to a liability to be placed in the category of those who are found carrying on actual war against the United States.

In thus repeating the proposition made in my former note, I beg to be understood as by no means intending to "introduce, to the injury of neutral states, any alteration in the well-established practice of international law." I am not disposed to contest the doctrine which I find laid down in your note on the treatment of the subjects of a neutral power

endeavoring to break a blockade. All that I ventured to suggest to your lordship was that, in the case now in question, *all* British subjects engaged in this work are made liable, under certain circumstances, to be treated *prima facie* as persons actually enlisted in the service of the enemy. I never denied that the power would still remain with them to relieve themselves by ultimately proving the contrary. What I wished to point out was the inconvenience of the process of thus shifting the burden of proof; for, whereas, in common cases, it is the duty of the captor to presume the parties to be neutrals, by the new element now introduced, it becomes his duty to presume them to be guilty until they can show the contrary.

I am the more earnest in making this representation that it is my conviction that the power to prevent the occurrence of this difficulty, and of the irritation that must necessarily grow out of it, rests in a great measure with her Majesty's government. It is by no means the wish of that which I have the honor to represent to resort to unnecessary harshness in the treatment of any persons who become involved in this painful war, and much less neutrals. But after the experience which it is constantly receiving of the manner in which the war has been and is sustained by the aid of men, money, and supplies from her Majesty's kingdom, it is no more than a simple duty to exercise all legitimate means in its power to suppress such operations. Knowingly to permit the subjects of neutral nations, actually serving in the ships of the enemy, to escape under the shelter of a flag which they wilfully abuse to the end of better effecting their resistance, is a degree of liberality which I am very confident no government would exercise in its own case or expect of the United States. If, as your lordship observes, British property to a very large amount has incurred the penalty of confiscation and condemnation during the present war, I feel sure that this calamity has not been visited upon her Majesty's subjects without painful, and earnest, and continued warnings, on my part, conveyed by direction of the government which I have the honor to represent.

Just so is it in the present instance. Feeling, as my government does, the serious injury inflicted upon the confidence which should always exist in the sacredness of the flag of a neutral nation by the detection of a plot to degrade it to a most sinister use, I have been directed to make a representation of the facts, as well as of some consequences that may naturally follow if measures of prevention be not adopted.

I cannot for a moment admit, in the view thus taken of the subject, there is the smallest variation proposed from a faithful and scrupulous observance of all the obligations imposed upon belligerents by the law of nations.

Having thus performed this duty to the best of my ability, I pray your lordship to accept the assurances of the highest consideration with which I have the honor to be, my lord, your lordship's most obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 901.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 5, 1864.

SIR: I have to acknowledge the receipt of your dispatch of the 18th ultimo, No. 621, which is accompanied by a copy of your correspondence

with Earl Russell respecting the treatment of persons captured on vessels violating the blockade in certain circumstances. In a letter of the 24th ultimo, Mr. Welles has proposed a course with which I have expressed my acquiescence, and which will remove the difficulty indicated in proper cases. It is, that in cases where there is no doubt of persons so captured being aliens, and the neutrality of the vessels in which they were captured is undoubted, to direct their discharge unless they are required as witnesses.

You are at liberty to make such use of this information as your judgment shall approve.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 647.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, April 8, 1864.

SIR: With my dispatch No. 621, of the 18th of March, I laid before you a copy of a note addressed by me, on the 15th of that month, to Lord Russell, on the subject of the fraudulent use by the rebels of the British flag to cover their vessels and crews in running the blockade. I now transmit a copy of the sequel of that correspondence.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *March 21, 1864.*

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 15th instant, respecting the course proposed to be adopted by the government of the United States with regard to British subjects found on board vessels captured in endeavoring to break the blockade.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 663.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, April 21, 1864.

SIR: I should have used the information contained in your dispatch No. 901, of the 5th instant, had it not been that the question involved in the position of the blockade breakers has again been changed by the later measures adopted at Richmond. It seems now that there can be no remaining doubt that every vessel engaged in blockade-running must

consent to be, at the same time, at the service of the enemy to aid him in carrying on the war.

I transmit herewith copies of two letters which have passed between Lord Russell and myself on this subject.

It has been stated in the newspapers, I know not by what authority, that the attorney general has given an opinion that any person engaged as a partner of the company proposed in the prospectus of the commercial company makes himself liable to prosecution under the enlistment act. I hear likewise, but from a private source, that the project has been abandoned. The same reasoning which applies to them appears to be valid against all private parties consenting to trade on the conditions prescribed by the same regulations.

On a full review of the correspondence as it stands, it does not seem to me advisable just now to interpose a variation from the positions as they have been actually taken. Should any change take place, however, admitting of an opportunity, it will be easy to suggest the qualified proposition of the Secretary of the Navy, of the propriety of which there can be no question. No such hypothesis as that on which it rests seems, under present circumstances, to be admissible.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, April 11, 1864.

SIR: I should not have thought it necessary to prolong the correspondence which has passed between us in regard to the treatment of British subjects found on board vessels captured in attempting to run the blockade, had it not been for the passage in your note of the 15th ultimo in which you say, "For whereas in common cases it is the duty of the captor to presume the parties to be neutrals, by the new element now introduced it becomes his duty to presume them to be guilty until they can show the contrary."

I feel it incumbent upon me to say, that if the meaning of this passage be that captured British vessels or their cargoes are generally to be treated, henceforth, on a different footing from that on which, by international law, all neutrals are placed—that is, if they are to be all presumed, in the first instance, to be engaged in the enemy's service, and to have thrown on them the burden of proving the contrary, her Majesty's government could only regard such conduct as a violation of international law, to which they could not in any way consent. Her Majesty's government must therefore protest against the adoption of such a course.

I have the honor to be with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, April 16, 1864.

MY LORD: I have the honor to acknowledge the reception of your

note of the 11th instant, taking exception to a passage in mine of the 15th ultimo.

I have carefully re-examined the circumstances connected with the proposition objected to, with the care which is customary with me when I find myself so unfortunate as to differ with your lordship, but I regret to confess my inability to arrive at any varied conclusion.

In further confirmation of the position taken, I now have the honor to transmit to you copies of certain papers which have lately come into my possession. These consist of a printed paper purporting to be an act passed by the insurgent authorities at Richmond, "to provide for the public defence," and another called "official regulations to carry into effect the aforesaid act." Inasmuch as these are found in a newspaper printed in London, and avowed to be in the interest of the insurgents, and entitled "confederate official documents," I presume there can be no question of their genuineness.

I pray your lordship's particular attention to the express condition exacted from all vessels engaged in trade with the insurgent ports, that one-half of the tonnage of each vessel may be employed by the so-called government for its own use both on the outward and homeward voyage.

In other words, the rebel authority insists upon the right to convey, on its own account, under the shelter of a neutral flag, the means to maintain its resistance to the United States, to the extent of at least one-half of the capacity of every vessel employed in the trade. This is a fact brought home to the knowledge of every person engaged in it, by the necessity of giving bonds for the faithful execution of the condition. Concurrently with this, I ask your lordship's attention to another paper, being an exact copy of a private and confidential circular which has been lately issued by parties well known in London. The object of this scheme is obviously concerted action to carry into full effect the purposes contemplated in the regulations aforesaid, to wit: to furnish facilities from this kingdom to the rebel authorities for transporting, on their own account, under the flag of Great Britain, supplies to enable them to continue the war, on the one side, and the commodities with which to pay for them, on the other.

I cannot avoid the conclusion that this proceeding, taken in all its parts, must be regarded by my government as placing British subjects and British ships engaged in this trade in the category of allies and servants of the insurgents; and inasmuch as no persons appear to be permitted to be engaged in it but those who comply with the conditions, it necessarily follows that all must be considered as enemies, and liable to be treated accordingly.

It is proper, however, for me here to observe, that I have made the present representations on the strength of general instructions heretofore given to me by my government. Time enough has not elapsed for it to receive information of the extraordinary facts developed by the appearance of these papers. I have felt it my imperative duty to lose no time in submitting this remonstrance to your lordship, while I transmit a copy for the approbation of my government.

I pray your lordship to accept the assurances of the highest consideration with which I have the honor to be, my lord, your most obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 728.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, June 23, 1864.

SIR: After a long interval Lord Russell has resumed the correspondence, copies of the first portion of which I transmitted to you with my dispatch No. 663, of the 21st of April last.

I now transmit copies of the two last notes which have passed on the same subject.

I have the honor to be, sir, your most obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *June 18, 1864.*

SIR: Her Majesty's government have not failed to consider with the attention they deserved, the observations contained in your note of the 16th of April, in which you inclosed copies of certain papers in confirmation of your position that British subjects captured in blockade runners may properly be treated by the United States as enemies, but I feel constrained to observe that in the opinion of her Majesty's government there is really nothing in the acts of the Congress of the so-styled Confederate States, or in the prospectus of the "Atlantic Trading Company, Limited," which either calls for or tends in any degree to explain or justify the orders issued by the United States government on this subject.

Her Majesty's government must continue to insist that it is not competent to the United States government to treat generally as enemies the subjects of her Majesty captured in the act of trading with the other belligerent, whatever may be the regulations of the confederate government under which that trade is carried on. If the circumstances of any peculiar case should prove that any of her Majesty's subjects have been taken while actively employed in the military service of the belligerent States, no just cause of complaint would be given if such subjects were treated as enemies. But the subjects of her Majesty are entitled by international law to carry on the operations of commerce equally with both belligerents, subject to the penalty of the capture of their vessels and to no other penalty, if they attempt to violate a properly constituted blockade or to carry contraband of war to the enemy. This is a proposition which Great Britain in common with all neutral states is bound to maintain and uphold, and her Majesty's government are decidedly of opinion that the circumstances under which the trade between the Confederate States and this country is now carried on are in no respect so exceptional as to entitle the United States government to depart in their manner of dealing with it from the ordinary course of procedure.

Her Majesty's minister at Washington will therefore be instructed to continue to protest against the course adopted by the United States government in this matter, and to press for the revocation of the orders issued by the United States government.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, June 20, 1864.

MY LORD: I have had the honor to receive your note of the 18th instant, in reply to that which I addressed to you on the 16th of April last, on the position in which British subjects who consent to navigate vessels destined to any port occupied by the insurgents in the United States are placed by the regulations established by those who assume to act by authority among them, without assenting to which they cannot be received.

Your lordship is pleased to observe that whatever may be the nature of those regulations, the subjects of her Majesty captured in the act of trading should not be treated as enemies. I regret to be compelled to adhere to the position heretofore assumed, that regulations which require as a preliminary condition to an act of trade that the vessels to the extent of one-half of their carrying capacity should be placed under the control of the so-called government, for conveying the public property used for the continued prosecution of the war in which it is engaged to and fro, necessarily take to that extent the character of transports engaged in the service of the enemy, and must be considered accordingly. All British subjects, therefore, who, as a preliminary to trade, voluntarily enter into a like compact, cannot be considered in any other light than as changing their neutral character of traders, and becoming for the occasion allies and servants to the insurgents in carrying on the war. As such they appear to forfeit their immunity in case of capture. It being apparent from this fixed opposition of sentiment that little can be hoped from further pressing my views upon your lordships here, I shall content myself with referring your latest note as well as the subject involved to my government, by whom I doubt not it will be again respectfully considered with an earnest desire to decide on it with the most scrupulous regard to every international obligation.

I pray your lordship to accept the assurances of the highest consideration with which I have the honor to be, my lord, your most obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 1026.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 9, 1864.

SIR: I have to acknowledge the receipt of your dispatch of the 23d of June, No. 728, which is accompanied by a copy of a further correspondence between Earl Russell and yourself on the subject of his claim for immunity for British subjects who engage in furnishing supplies of arms and munitions to the insurgents, in vessels owned or chartered by the pretended insurgent authorities, or running the blockade under contract with them. I am now authorized to approve of the position you have assumed, and to say that this government deems itself justified in adhering to the principle that British subjects who intervene in our civil war in the manner which I have hereinbefore mentioned, are by the law of nations liable to be treated by this government as enemies of the

United States, having no lawful claim to be protected by her Majesty's government.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

BLOCKADE RUNNING—THE BERMUDA.

Mr. Wilding to Mr. F. W. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 31.]

UNITED STATES CONSULATE,
Liverpool, August 16, 1861.

SIR: I had the honor to inform you, in dispatch No. 30, by the City of Washington, on the 14th, that the crates containing arms, packed to resemble earthenware, mentioned in my Nos. 28 and 29, had gone, by various circuitous routes to West Hartlepool, a place on east coast of England, and been there put on board the screw steamer Bermuda, mentioned in my No. 23 as building and nearly finished at Stockton-on-Tees, for Messrs. Fraser, Trenholm & Co., the Liverpool branch of John Fraser & Co., of Charleston, S. C. I also gave a description of the Bermuda, which I now repeat:

"Two-masted, brig rigged, funnel—lower part black, upper part red—black hull, with narrow red stripe round the molding level with the deck; no poop; wheel-house white; her bottom pink up to water-line; no figure-head; no bowsprit; armed with four guns; has six white boats slung in iron davits; is under the English flag; hails from Liverpool; and is commanded by a Frenchman."

I would call attention to her armament, which may, and likely will, be increased before she sails; also to the number of boats; also to the probability of some change being made in her appearance before she approaches America, by changing the color of her funnel, &c.

I have also traced the powder trucks (mentioned in my No. 30) from Preston Brook to West Hartlepool, and believe the barrels sent on them (weighing together seven tons) do not contain powder, as described, but ball cartridges. Of course they are gone also to the Bermuda.

The arms and munitions are mostly stowed at the bottom of the vessel, and covered with bales. The quantity she has on board must be very great.

* * * * *

I have the honor to be your obedient servant,

H. J. WILDING.

Hon. F. W. SEWARD,
Assistant Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 27.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, August 16, 1861.

SIR: I have been for weeks apprised of the rumor that somewhere on the eastern coast of Great Britain a steamer was building for the use of

the insurgents. The reality has at length taken shape, and is reported to be now lying at West Hartlepool, whither crates and barrels, presumed to contain arms and ammunition, have been in process of transmission by railway from various points north and east until now, when I am informed the vessel is nearly ready to start.

On the strength of the information furnished by the consular authorities of the United States at Liverpool and at Leeds, I have felt it my duty to call the attention of the secretary of state for foreign affairs to the facts, and to request an investigation, to the end that the steamer may be stopped, and the parties engaged in the transaction, if it prove to be as alleged, may be duly punished. I have the honor to transmit a copy of my note to Lord Russell on this subject.

Should the steamer escape seizure, I should at any rate hope that the notice will come in season to warn the armed ships of the United States of her approach, and to prepare them to render her and her cargo powerless for mischief.

A copy of the reply of Lord Russell to my note, which has just come in, is transmitted with this dispatch.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,

London, August 15, 1861.

MY LORD: From information furnished from sources which appear to me entitled to credit, I feel it my duty to apprise her Majesty's government that a violation of the act prohibiting the fitting out of vessels for war-like purposes is on the point of being committed in one of the ports of Great Britain, whereby an armed steamer is believed to be about to be dispatched with the view of making war against the people of the United States.

It is stated to me that a new screw steamer, called the *Bermuda*, ostensibly owned by the commercial house of Fraser, Trenholm & Co., of Liverpool, well known to consist in part of Americans in sympathy with the insurgents in the United States, is now lying at West Hartlepool, ready for sea. She is stated to carry English colors, but to be commanded by a Frenchman. She is two-masted, brig-rigged, lower part of funnel black and upper part red, black hull, with a narrow red stripe round the molding level with the deck, no poop, wheel-house painted white, six white boats slung in iron davits. She has neither figure-head nor bowsprit. Her bottom is painted pink up to the water-line.

This steamer is *armed with four guns*, and she has been for some time taking in crates, cases, and barrels believed to contain arms and ammunition of all kinds ordinarily used in carrying on war.

This cargo is nominally entered as destined to Havana in the island of Cuba. But her armament and cargo are of such a nature as to render it morally certain that the merchants who claim to be the owners can have no intention of dispatching her on any errand of mercy or of peace.

I am informed that this vessel will sail in a day or two; I therefore feel under the highest obligation to submit the information I have obtained

as the ground for an application for a prompt and effective investigation of the truth of the allegations whilst there is time. Not doubting the earnest disposition of her Majesty's government faithfully to adhere to the principles of neutrality to which it has pledged itself, I ask on the part of the United States for no more than a simple enforcement of the law, in case it shall appear that evil-minded persons are seeking to set it at naught.

I pray your lordship to accept the assurances of the high consideration with which I have the honor to be, your lordship's obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, August 15, 1861.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of this day calling the attention of her Majesty's government to a steam vessel now fitting out at Hartlepool, which you state it is believed is about to be dispatched with a view of making war against the people of the United States, and I have to acquaint you that I have lost no time in communicating with the proper department of her Majesty's government on the subject.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 30.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
 London, August 23, 1861.

SIR: *

Since my last dispatch the Bermuda has sailed with more than seventy tons of gunpowder on board and large quantities of other stores. Yesterday I received from Lord Russell a note in answer to my representation made the 16th instant, a copy of which was transmitted with my dispatch No. 27. You will perceive by the tenor of the reply, a copy of which I now send, that no assistance can be expected from the government here, in preventing the transmission of these supplies. The true reliance must be upon the activity of our own officers and the energy of our own administration. *

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
 Secretary of State.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, August 22, 1861.

SIR: I acquainted you in my letter of the 15th instant, that I had lost no time in communicating with the proper department of her Majesty's

government respecting the steam-vessel fitting out at Hartlepool, which you believed was about to be dispatched with a view of making war against the people of the United States.

I have now the honor to state to you that the result of the inquiries into this case having been submitted to the proper law officer of the Crown, her Majesty's government have been advised that there is not sufficient evidence to warrant any interference with the clearance or the sailing of the vessel.

The 7th section of the foreign enlistment act, 59 Geo. III, cap. 69, applies to the equipment of a vessel for the purpose of being employed in the service of a foreign state as a transport or cruiser, but has no reference to the mere nature of the cargo on board, and there is at present no proved intention that the vessel itself is to be employed for a warlike purpose.

The persons engaged in the venture must take the consequences which, according to the law of nations, may happen to ensue during transit, owing to a portion of the cargo loaded by them being contraband of war.

I am, &c.,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Adams to Mr Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 35.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, August 30, 1861.

SIR: * * * * *

You will before this have formed some notion of the extent of my power in this way from my success in preventing the departure of the *Bermuda*. No stronger case is likely to be made out against any parties than this. The activity of our consuls, Messrs. Wilding and Davy, furnished me with very exact information of all the circumstances attending the equipment of this vessel, and yet her Majesty's government, on being apprised of it, disclaimed all power to interfere.

Under these circumstances, all that seems left to me to do is to gather such information of these movements as I may for transmission to the department in season to be on the look-out to intercept the supplies before they reach the coast.

I am notified by Mr. Wilding of certain reported negotiations for the purchase of the steamers *Leopold*, *Princess Charlotte*, and *Southampton*, which have excited his suspicions. He will doubtless furnish fresh intelligence, as he obtains it, directly to the department.

* * * * *

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 38.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, September 6, 1861.

SIR: *

There is no doubt that the house of Fraser, Trenholm & Co., of Liverpool, with which Mr. Prioleau is actively associated, have been the main channel through which the purchase and equipment of the Bermuda, which sailed on the 18th ultimo, were conducted. The dispatch of that vessel is the most effective thing that has been done here; and if her seventy tons of gunpowder should reach its destination, it would be a most important agent in continuing the war, not to speak of clothing and the minor aids and comforts of the rest of her cargo. Of my want of success in preventing the departure of that vessel you are already fully apprised. In point of fact, the government of the United States is wholly without power here, outside its own official organization.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 86.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, September 11, 1861.

SIR: Your dispatch of August 23d has been received.

The inefficiency of the British laws to prevent violations of our rights is deeply to be regretted. We shall necessarily be obliged to exercise vigilance in detecting the unlawful character and objects of British vessels approaching our coasts, which will not be pleasant to the government whose flag they will be perverting to such unfriendly uses.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[Transmitted with dispatch from Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward, No. 77, November 23, 1861.]

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

[Extract.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, November 22, 1861.

On the 15th of August last the undersigned had the honor to address a note to his lordship, pointing out the case of the steamer "Bermuda," laden with a great amount of contraband of war, then about to depart from a port of Great Britain. That steamer is known subsequently to

have made its way into the harbor of Savannah, in the State of Georgia, a port held by the insurgents against the government of the United States. To that application the undersigned had the honor to receive for answer from his lordship that there was no evidence in the hands of her Majesty's government sufficient to establish the intent of a wrongful voyage, and therefore that the parties who might afterwards engage in it only deprived themselves of all protection from the consequences to them that might attend its ultimate prosecution.

Not insensible to the force of this reasoning upon a technical construction of the terms of her Majesty's proclamation, and of the statute to which it referred, the undersigned has desisted from making further representations in several subsequent cases of a similar kind which have heretofore come within his knowledge, and are even now under his observation. Neither is it at all within his present purpose to enter into any complaint of her Majesty's government for this course. Much regret as he entertains at the annoyance and consequent irritation naturally excited among the citizens of his country by the observation of what may be made to appear to be hostile acts, though undoubtedly not so intended, he is too well aware of the difficulties inherent in the operations of every free government not to be ready to make large allowance for the skill which evil-disposed persons may use to evade the provisions of the most stringent law.

The undersigned, &c.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Dudley to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 16.]

UNITED STATES CONSULATE,
Liverpool, February 14, 1862.

SIR :

The Bermuda, now loading, up to this date has taken on board one hundred cases 5½-inch shells, one hundred cases 3-inch shells, three hundred and twenty-five cases 7½-inch shells, three rifled cannon, 7½-inch bore, two rifled cannon, 5½-inch bore, two rifled cannon, 3-inch bore, and three breech-loading rifled cannon of the Whitworth patent; one ten feet long, 8½-inch bore, and the other two larger than this; six wooden gun-carriages for ships or garrisons, and twelve for field-pieces; one hundred and fifty-six tons saltpeter, nineteen cases of small-arms, six cases, clasped and bound with iron, very heavy, and three other cases, contents unknown. Her captain's name is C. William Westendorff, as you will perceive from the inclosure marked No. 1, containing a note written by him.

There is much activity among the southern agents, more than there has been at any time before since my arrival in England.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully, your obedient servant,
THOMAS H. DUDLEY

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

This is to certify that the bearer, Michael Bords, is employed as cook on board steamer Bermuda.

O. WM. WESTENDORFF.

JULY 13, 1862.

Mr. Dudley to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 17.]

UNITED STATES CONSULATE,
Liverpool, February 15, 1862.

SIR:

* * * * *

Edwin Haigh, of Liverpool, the cotton broker of Fraser, Trenholm & Co., is the nominal owner of the steamer Bermuda, now loading at this port for Bermuda. The register is in his name, but it is understood that she belongs to the South, and that his name is merely used for the purpose of having her register as an English vessel. Within the last two days they have taken off the old gilding from the stem of the ship, and put on in its place a palmetto tree. Since my dispatch of yesterday, she has taken on the following additional cargo: One very heavy rifled cannon, ten cases rather light, contents unknown, forty-six cases 8½-inch hollow shells, seventy-seven cases 7½-inch hollow shells, nine heavy casks, contents unknown, fifty-eight very heavy cases, contents unknown, thirty bundles sappers' spades, three small round cases, six bales, five small cases, supposed to contain implements.

I am, sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

THOMAS H. DUDLEY,
*United States Consul.*Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
*Secretary of State.**Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.*

No. 276.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 23, 1862.

SIR: I transmit to you herewith, for your information, the copy of a letter of the 21st instant from the assistant attorney of the United States for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, with the printed copy of the record, in the case of the United States *vs.* The prize steamer Bermuda and cargo, which accompanied it.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

*Mr. Ashton to Mr. Seward.*OFFICE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY E. D. OF PENN.,
128 South Sixth street, Philadelphia, June 21, 1862.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit to the Department of State, by the same mail with this, a printed copy of the record in the case of the United States *vs.* The prize steamer Bermuda and cargo.

I send this document because I thought that the department might probably desire to possess a copy of it.

I would call your attention especially to the important letter* printed

* For inclosure see dispatch from Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams, No. 278, June 25, 1862.

on page 146 of the book, which gives more particularly than any other paper in the cause the scheme of the voyage of this vessel.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

J. HUBLEY ASHTON,
Assistant U. S. Attorney.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 278.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 25, 1862.

SIR: I herewith inclose for your information the copy of a letter of yesterday from the assistant attorney of the United States for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, in which reference is made to the unsigned letter to which he called the attention of the department in his communication of the 21st of this month, in the case of the United States *vs.* The steamer Bermuda, a copy of which communication accompanied my dispatch to you, No. 276, of the 23d instant.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCOIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Ashton to Mr. Seward.

OFFICE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY E. D. PENN.,
128 South Sixth street, Philadelphia, June 24, 1862.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 23d instant, requesting me to forward to the department two additional copies of the printed record in the case of the prize steamer Bermuda. I transmit by the mail which carries this letter the copies that you request.

I would remark that I have discovered that the unsigned letter to which I called the attention of the department, printed upon page 146 of the pamphlet, is in the handwriting of the mate of the Bermuda, Edward Charles Reed. The letter bears no signature, but it is obviously in the same handwriting as the log-book of the steamer, which was kept by Reed, the mate.

I have the honor to be, very truly and respectfully, your obedient servant,

J. HUBLEY ASHTON,
Assistant U. S. Attorney.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

[Letter referred to in preceding communication.]

(No. 92, H. F.)

LIVERPOOL, WELLINGTON DOCK, *February 16, 1862.*

MY DEAR SIR: I have waited in vain to receive a few lines from you, to tell me that you are still in the land of the living, but I suppose since

you left the Bermuda you have been hard at it, and have not had time to drop us a few lines. I'll excuse you if so, and will act upon the Christian motto, "Do unto others as you wish them to do to you;" and although it is freezing at present and I have to beat my fingers at times to keep the blood in motion, I take my pen and send you these few lines.

First, about the old ship: we have been in dock; found her bottom in an awful state, and although that smart man that came round to pilot us to Liverpool did his best to get all the rust and dirt off her bottom, on the banks and shoals, which abound near the mouth of the Thames, there was enough left to make a stranger think that she had been submerged in salt water for the last five years. We have got her all right now and are ready and anxious to give you a trial of speed in the Bahama in spite of superheaters, and I don't know what. By the bye, that reminds me of what Mr. Graham told me this morning. It appears he got a letter this morning from Mr. Blair, not exactly couched in most complimentary terms about him running your engines down; I couldn't help laughing when I heard of it, because I was present when the conversation took place that Mr. Blair hints at. Captain Tessier was on board Saturday before last, and looking down the skylight remarked, you have a fine engine there, Mr. Graham. I and my captain was standing close to, when Mr. Graham laughingly remarked, yes, indeed, better than yours; we'll beat you all to fits when we get out. Although Captain Tessier laughed and said Mr. Gray don't think so, he either believed that Mr. Graham was in earnest or represented it so to Mr. Blair. The consequence our chief got a blowing up, which makes him like Captain Tessier not a whit more, I can tell you. I think it myself rather mean; he must have seen that Graham was joking. He is going to write to Mr. Blair, and explain the thing to him.

We are all the talk of Liverpool at present, taking in those large rifled cannon, (without cases,) and large lots of ammunition and materials of war. In American circles our fate is discussed pretty freely; they have us taken, imprisoned, and hung already. Our friend of Harlepool notoriety, Mr. Detective Maguire, has got a job here again—is regularly to be seen on the quay to take a look of what is going on board. They put the custom-house inspectors to a great deal of trouble, because they are coming down every day, opening boxes and cases—to satisfy J—. What the inspector said to me yesterday—that there existed great jealousy on account of our cargo, but fortunately they cannot stop us. We are on a lawful voyage; people won't believe it here; they are bound to think we are for running the blockade again. Our tender left yesterday; don't be at all surprised we have got a tender; they bought a light-draught boat at Dublin, used to run the mail once, called the *Herald*; length, 280 feet; deep water-line, 10 feet; light, 5½; side width,* 225; horse, nominal, used to press up to 28 pounds; got her boilers stayed, strengthened, and so forth; strain up to 20 pounds now; average speed, 18½ knots per hour; razed all her lower cabins to make cargo space; shipped over for twelve months for some port or ports south of Mason and Dixon's line. Three captains on board; one an Englishman, nominal; another an experienced coast pilot from the Potomac to Charleston; another ditto, ditto, from Charleston to the San Juan River in Texas. If the Yankees reach her, they are smarter than I give them credit for. She waits our arrival in Bermuda; goes first into Charleston, though, to see about the stone fleet. Don't tell Tessier I gave you the information; he'll write straight to the owners, and tell

them I am a traitor, and blabber out secrets; I know him. I have seen the owners; all fudge what he told me. Mr. Prelean (principal man) came up to me; shook hands; said was glad to see me; I said, I hope I didn't incur your displeasure by remaining in the Bermuda. *Answer.* Not at all. You wrote to me some time ago; was very busy; have got no ships at present to dispose of; shall have the first chance that offers. Much obliged to you. Mr. Wellsman (second man) didn't know him before, came up, Captain Westendorff along with him, he saying to this, Mr. P'len. Yes. I'm glad to make your acquaintance. Captain Tessier gives you a hard name; going to remain in the Bermuda? Yes, sir. All right; stick to her; you shan't regret it.

Mr. A. GRAY, *Stockton-on-Tees.*

BLOCKADE RUNNING—THE FINGAL.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 59.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, October 17, 1861.

SIR:

Since the date of my last, the steamer Fingal, being the second experiment of the kind, has sailed, in company with a smaller vessel, the bark Amelia, containing cartridges and gunpowder. They are cleared for Honduras, but it is stated by Mr. Cook, lately the vice-consul at Glasgow, in a letter to me, that the captain expressed in private his intention to try the mouth of the Mississippi, and failing in that, to beach the vessel on the coast, trusting to the means he had to unload her cargo in a very few hours. It appears by the newspapers that the Fingal came into collision on Monday night with a Sardinian bark, and sunk her; but there is no account whether she herself received any damage or not.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

[Extract.]

No. 634.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 22, 1863.

SIR: Reports from Vicksburg and Port Hudson state that the sieges of those places still continue. We learn to-day, through the insurgent press, that the Fingal, which, during her long imprisonment at Savannah, had been converted into an iron-clad ship of war, was last week captured by two of our iron-clad ships of war, on her attempting to leave the port and enter upon her work of piracy.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

BLOCKADE RUNNING—THE GLADIATOR.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 69.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, November 8, 1861.

SIR:

You have already received intelligence of the equipment of the *Gladiator* from this port. So confident has the success of the *Bermuda* made the undertakers here, that they no longer affect much concealment in their preparations. The storehouses on the pier to which the *Gladiator* is attached have contained the boxes she is to convey, marked as holding arms, and the fact of her destination has been allowed to become generally known. It is, moreover, averred that merchants here have associated to send out by her and other vessels quantities of contraband goods and other supplies, on subscription of three hundred pound shares, and with the expectation that if only one in three ventures should succeed in running the blockade, the excess of profit will more than counterbalance the loss.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Whiting to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 44.]

UNITED STATES CONSULATE,
Nassau, N. P., December 12, 1861.

SIR: I have the honor to inclose to your address a true and faithful copy of the letter addressed to me by the colonial secretary, as directed by the lieutenant governor, Nesbitt, of the Bahamas, in answer to my own addressed to him on the 9th instant, relative to the arrival of the *Gladiator*.

I have the honor to be, &c.,
SAMUEL WHITING, *Consul.*

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

BAHAMAS.

COLONIAL SECRETARY'S OFFICE,
Nassau, December 10, 1861.

SIR: I am directed by the lieutenant governor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 9th instant, in which you state that you deem it your bounden duty to inform his excellency of the arrival at

49 A C—VOL. I

this port, on the last-mentioned date, "of the British steamer *Gladiator*, laden with arms and munitions of war for the rebel States of America," and that you were advised of her clearance for this port with this "contraband of war," and "earnestly appealing to his excellency to prevent her cargo from being re-shipped or transported to the United States for the use of those in arms to overthrow that government."

His excellency desires me to assure you of his anxiety to preserve the strict neutrality which her Majesty has enjoined in the royal proclamation of the 13th May last, and to enforce the same on all her Majesty's subjects, and others in this colony, so far as the law will justify him.

His excellency has, with this view, made careful inquiry into the case of the steamer *Gladiator*, and finds that she is registered in London, and left that port ostensibly on "a voyage to Teneriffe, thence to Nassau, N. P., and any other places in the West Indies, east coast of South and North America, and back to a port in the United Kingdom;" and in the report made by the master at the treasury under the colonial law, it is stated that she is bound from Teneriffe to Vera Cruz, with a general cargo, *not to be landed here*; the avowed object of her entering this port being to coal.

As far as these papers show, the voyage is a legal one; and the fact of there being arms and other munitions of war on board of her will not of itself alter the legal character of the transaction, as there exists no prohibition, as far as his excellency is aware, to the conveyance in a British ship from one British port to another, or from a British port to a neutral one, of arms or other munitions of war as cargo.

Unless, therefore, you are prepared with such evidence as will be receivable in a British court of law to prove that the arms and other munitions of war, now alleged by you to be on board of the *Gladiator*, have been shipped for the purpose of conveyance, and are now in the course of conveyance to some port of the Confederate States of America, his excellency is advised that the vessel cannot be viewed as a "store-ship" within the meaning of the act of Parliament referred to in her Majesty's proclamation, and that the authorities of this colony have no right to interfere with her or her cargo, or to withhold from her any of those privileges which, as a British ship, she is entitled to in a British port.

I have the honor to be, &c.,

A. J. THOMPSON,
Colonial Secretary.

UNITED STATES CONSUL, *Nassau, N. P.*

Mr. Whiting to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

UNITED STATES CONSULATE,
At Nassau, N. P., January 19, 1862.

SIR: *

While I am writing the rebel steamer *Caroline*, (now *Kate*), Lockwood, master, which arrived yesterday from Charleston, is lying alongside of the ship *Eliza Bonsall*, taking on board the remainder of the cargo destined for the rebel States.

The *Isabel*, or *Ella Warley*, took part of the same ship's cargo some weeks since. *

The Gladiator, steamer, is also transshipping her arms, I am told, at Cochrane's anchorage, ten miles from Nassau.

I have the honor, &c.,

SAMUEL WHITING, *Consul.*

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Whiting to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 10.]

UNITED STATES CONSULATE,
At Nassau, N. P., February 12, 1862.

SIR: I have the honor to inform you that within the past week there has been four arrivals of small schooners from Charleston, South Carolina, all laden with cotton, and this morning the rebel steamer Catwaba arrived here, "*direct from Charleston,*" fully laden with rice and cotton, and flying the "secession rag" at her peak, to the mortification of the *loyal Americans* here, and to the intense gratification of the *Conchs*.

* * * * *

I have the honor to inform you also that the Gladiator is still here; two steamers from Charleston have taken most of her powder and arms, and the Catawba will complete the rest.

I have the honor, &c.,

SAMUEL WHITING, *Consul.*

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Dudley to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 101.]

UNITED STATES CONSULATE,
Liverpool, August 1, 1862.

SIR: * * * * *

The steamer Gladiator, so often referred to in this correspondence, sailed on Wednesday last, the 30th instant, as soon as she got her gunpowder on board. As an evidence of the indulgence, if not aid, afforded to all of these vessels loaded to run the blockade, and to carry arms, ammunition, and munitions of war to the rebels, by the authorities at this port, (I will not say the government,) while this vessel sailed on Wednesday last, and must have cleared either on that day or the day before at the custom-house, and her clearance should have been published in the bill of entry (the official publication of clearances) yesterday at the latest, it does not appear either yesterday or to-day. Nor is this all. There has been as yet no entry made of any part of her cargo at the customs, and the vessel is published in this day's bill of entry as now loading in the dock, when she sailed two days ago, and is now probably one hundred miles west of Cape Clear.

* * * * *

I have the honor to be, very respectfully, your obedient servant,
THOMAS H. DUDLEY, *Consul.*

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Dudley to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 105.]

UNITED STATES CONSULATE,
Liverpool, August 8, 1862.

SIR: Referring to dispatch No. 101, and the sailing of the steamer *Gladiator*, I have now to state that on the 5th instant the official publication of the clearance of this vessel was made. You will recollect she sailed on the 30th of July. On the 4th of August, six days after she sailed, she was entered to load for Bermuda, and on the same day cleared for the last-named port. At this time, when she was entered to load for Bermuda, she was probably one thousand miles from Liverpool on her journey. The official publication was made on the day after, August 5. The first publication of her cargo was made to-day. I have obtained a copy of her manifest, so far as the cargo has been entered at the custom-house. You will see that her cargo is of a nature that fully justified me in saying that she ought to be captured wherever found. There are already entered six hundred and seventy-five thousand cartridges, two million nine hundred and forty thousand percussion caps, one hundred and six thousand six hundred pounds of gunpowder, eleven thousand five hundred and seventy rifles, nine thousand eight hundred and forty muskets, eighteen brass cannon, and six *steel rifled cannon*, eighty-six tons salt-peter, with swords, pistols, &c.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully, your obedient servant,
THOMAS H. DUDLEY, *Consul*.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

BLOCKADE RUNNING—THE GEORGIANA.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 301.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, January 22, 1863.

SIR: In consequence of representations made to Mr. Morse and myself, in which we had confidence, I decided upon addressing to Lord Russell a note of remonstrance against the departure of the steamer *Georgiana* from Liverpool. A copy of that note and of the consul's letter on which it was founded is herewith transmitted. At the same time, being conscious of the inability to make use of the evidence actually in possession, I sent to Mr. Dudley, the consul at Liverpool, a request to make an effort to re-enforce it with testimony at that place. He did so, but failed in obtaining any which could corroborate the affirmations beyond the single fact of the cutting of four port-holes. In the mean time Lord Russell notified me that he had ordered an investigation, which did not make out to reach even that point. Copies of all the papers emanating from him are appended. The *Georgiana* has since sailed. But I remain of opinion that the representation of her character is well founded, and that she is to be fitted out as an armed cruiser at Nassau, or perhaps Charleston. Her commander has already escaped once from the supervision of Captain Craven by destroying his confederate commission. It is to be

hoped that other officers may be so apprised of the facts as not to let him slip if overhauled a second time.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, January 16, 1863.

MY LORD: It has become my painful duty to call your lordship's attention to one more of the cases in which the neutral territory of Great Britain is abused by evil-disposed persons for the worst of purposes, in the present war. I have the honor to transmit a copy of a letter addressed to me by the consul of the United States at London, giving the particulars based upon credible information received by him, the authority for which it is not in his power at present to disclose. As the vessel is known to be on the eve of departure from the port of Liverpool, I fear I have not the time necessary to procure corroborative evidence from that place. Under these circumstances I feel myself impelled to make this representation without further delay. I have reason to believe that the vessel in question is intended to pursue a similar course with that formerly called No. 290, to wit, the destruction of the commerce of the United States. I therefore solicit the interposition of her Majesty's government, at least so far as to enable me to procure further evidence to establish the proof of the allegations here made, in season for the prevention of this nefarious enterprise.

Praying your lordship to accept the assurances of my highest consideration, I have the honor to be, my lord, your most obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Morse to Mr. Adams.

CONSULATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, January 16, 1863.

SIR: I have information, on evidence which secures my belief, that the iron screw steamer *Georgiana*, Captain Davidson, now in London graving dock, Liverpool, is intended for a confederate privateer, and is now fitting for the business of privateering. She was built in the yard of Mr. Laurie, at Glasgow. Mr. George Wigg, of New Orleans, contracted to have her built. She is now, I presume, but temporarily (for security until she gets off) registered in the name of Neil Mathieson, secretary of the Confederate Aid Association at Glasgow. She is so constructed that armor plating could be put on to her at any time after leaving the port where she was constructed.

She is a well-built, fast vessel, rigged for fore-and-aft sails, and is over four hundred tons, net measurement. She left Glasgow for Liverpool on the 3d of the present month, and is now at the last-named port pre-

paring for sea. She has port-holes cut for four rifled cannon, and bolts, &c., arranged for them, since she left Glasgow; and also a portion of her armor plating put on, and small-arms enough for a crew of privateersmen. She will take some forty or fifty men, all told, from Liverpool, and make up a full crew after leaving. Among these now engaged is a gunner, once a sergeant in the royal artillery. She is advertised for Nassau, and will pretend to go out as a regular trader.

I regret that I am unable to sustain the above statement by the affidavits of my informants; but I am bound in honor not to use their names. My information concerning this steamer, for the last five or six weeks, confirms the accuracy of the statement, and I have full confidence in its truth.

The *Georgiana* will call at Queenstown for coal.

Your obedient servant,

F. H. MORSE, *Consul*.

Hon. CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, *United States Minister*.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *January 17, 1863.*

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt this day of your letter of the 16th instant, inclosing a letter from the United States consul in London, giving the particulars based upon credible information received by him, the authority for which it is not in his power at present to disclose, respecting an iron screw steamer named the *Georgiana*, Captain Davidson, now lying in the London graving dock at Liverpool, which he believes to be intended for a confederate privateer, and to be now fitting out for the business of privateering.

I have communicated copies of your letter and of its inclosure to the board of the treasury and to the secretary of state for the home department without delay; and I have requested that orders might be sent by telegraph to the proper authorities at Liverpool enjoining them to take such steps in the matter as may legally be taken.

I think it right, however, to observe that her Majesty's government cannot be answerable for any difficulty which may be experienced in carrying out those orders, in consequence of the evidence on which the statement of the United States consul is made being withheld from them.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *January 18, 1863.*

SIR: I have the honor to transmit to you herewith, with reference to my letter of yesterday, a copy of a telegram received to-day from the collector of customs at Liverpool, reporting the result of the inquiry which he was instructed to make respecting the vessel *Georgiana*, refer-

red to in your letter of the 16th instant as being in course of fitting out at Liverpool as a confederate privateer.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Copy of a telegram from the collector of customs at Liverpool to F. Goulburn, Esq.

Georgiana, British, four hundred and seven tons register; brig rig; cargo, merchandise, provisions, and drugs; no guns on deck; no fitting for guns on board; one cwt. powder; iron bulwarks; no port-holes for guns; no fittings for guns on board; a fast vessel; forty crew; not fitted as a privateer; better adapted for running the blockade; cleared out for Nassau; now in the Mersey, and is intended to leave to-day, say 4 p. m.

SUNDAY, January 18.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, January 19, 1863.

SIR: With reference to my letters of the 17th and 18th instant, I have now the honor to transmit to you copies of reports received at the treasury from the commissioners of customs respecting the steamer Georgiana, assumed in your letter of the 16th instant to be fitting out at Liverpool as a confederate privateer.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Edwards to Mr. Goulburn.

CUSTOM-HOUSE,
Liverpool, January 18, 1863.

SIR: With reference to the telegram received from you between eight and nine o'clock last night, as also to your letter received this morning, the accompanying statement from Mr. Morgan, the surveyor, will show the steps that were taken in regard to the screw steamer Georgiana, Captain Davidson, which left the London dock yesterday morning with a general cargo for Nassau.

A reply was sent to your private address at half past eleven to-day, which I hoped would reach you as soon as you would get home from church.

The exact details of the cargo cannot be given you until to-morrow, as I have no means of getting at the papers, there being no one here save myself. I will send you at the same time every detail regarding the vessel that I can learn, but can now assert that the ship is *not* intended for being used as a privateer, but, no doubt, for running the blockade,

although of this there is no proof save that deduced from the nature of the cargo.

You will perceive by Mr. Morgan's observations that there are no port-holes cut for guns. In short I see nothing whatever that would warrant her being detained.

I am, &c., &c.,

S. PRICE EDWARDS.

F. GOULBURN, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Morgan to the Collector.

SUNDAY, January 18, 1863.

SIR: Last night, about ten o'clock, I received the telegram sent to you relative to the Georgiana, but, being too late, I had no alternative but to wait till this morning early, when I went in search of the vessel, and found that she had hauled into the river on Saturday.

I gave directions to the acting assistant surveyor, Mr. Webb, to accompany me to her, but, as we were going, I met the master of her, (Davidson,) who informed me that all the ship's papers were ashore.

I then accompanied the master, while Webb went to the vessel. On my inspecting the papers, I found nothing to induce the suspicion that she was intended for privateering. She had a great many bills of lading, in which the goods (cargo) were consigned to parties at Nassau.

Amongst other things, there were a great many packages of drugs, which convinced me that they were intended to run through the blockade.

I also saw the ship's articles, upon which the names of all the crew stood. The amounts set against their respective names, forty in number, were not higher rates of wages than usual; and his charter-party was in the usual style, and destined him to Nassau, Havana, or New Orleans.

On the return of the officer from the ship, he stated that she had no port-holes, no guns, and no fittings for guns on deck, and nothing to denote that she was intended for a privateer.

Under these circumstances I am respectfully of opinion that she is in no way subject to detention.

Very respectfully,

C. MORGAN, *Surveyor.*

The COLLECTOR.

Mr. Goulburn to Mr. Hamilton.

5 PRINCE'S TERRACE,
Sunday, January 18—12.30 p. m.

MY DEAR MR. HAMILTON: After the communication you made to me last evening, and in accordance with your desire, I telegraphed to Liverpool, desiring the answer to be sent as soon as possible to-day (as it was Sunday) to my house. I have just received it, and you will find an exact copy on the other side. You will see the description of the vessel, Georgiana, sent, and on the correctness of which I am sure you may confidently rely, does not, in any way, bear out the facts stated in the information forwarded to the United States minister. Under these circumstances,

without further directions from you, I shall not issue any orders to detain the vessel.

I have written this as a record of what has passed between us, but shall bring this letter myself to you *at once* and take your directions.

I am, &c.,

FRED'K GOULBURN.

[Telegram.]

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS,
Liverpool, January 18.

F. GOULBURN, Esq., *5 Prince's Terrace, Knights' Bridge :*

Georgiana, British, four hundred and seven tons register; brig rig; cargo, merchandise, provisions, and drugs; no guns on deck; no fittings for guns on board; one hundred-weight pounder, [powder]; iron bulwarks; no port-holes for guns; no fittings for guns on board; a fast vessel; forty crew; not fitted as a privateer; better adapted for running the blockade; cleared out for Nassau; now in the Mersey, and is intended to leave to-day, say 4 p. m.

[See Mr. Adams's dispatch to Mr. Seward, No. 374, April 16, 1862, *post*, as to guns on board.]

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 311.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, January 29, 1863.

SIR: Since the date of my dispatch No. 301, I have had some further correspondence with Lord Russell on the subject of the steamer Georgiana. Copies of the papers are herewith transmitted. It will be perceived that the later materially contradicts the earlier testimony. In the mean time the vessel departed. It is now boldly stated in the Liverpool newspapers that she is to act as a tender to No. 290.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *January 24, 1863.*

SIR: With reference to my letter of the 19th instant, I have the honor to inclose for your information the following papers respecting the case of the screw-steamer Georgiana, viz:

1. A copy of the instructions addressed by the secretary of state for the home department to the mayor of Liverpool.
2. Copies of reports received from the mayor of Liverpool in reply.
3. A copy, received through the treasury, of a report respecting the Georgiana, addressed to the commissioner of customs by Mr. Webb, the acting assistant surveyor of customs at Liverpool.
4. The manifest, and a copy of the victualling bill of that vessel.

These last named papers I have to request that you will be good enough to return to me after perusal.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Mr. Waddington to the Mayor of Liverpool.

[Confidential.]

WHITEHALL, January 17, 1863.

SIR: I am directed by Secretary Sir George Grey to acquaint you that he has received a letter from the foreign office inclosing a communication, which has been made by the American minister in this country, respecting a vessel named the Georgiana, supposed to be fitting out at Liverpool for the use of the Confederate States. It is said that this vessel was built in Mr. Laurie's yard, at Glasgow, to the order of Mr. George Wigg, of New Orleans, and is now registered in the name of Neil Mattheson, secretary of the Confederate Aid Association of Glasgow.

She is at present in the London graving dock at Liverpool. I am to request that you will cause immediate inquiry to be made by the police respecting this vessel, in order that, if it shall appear that the parties concerned in the business are acting in contravention of the law, information on oath may be taken, (59 Geo. III, c. 69,) as required by the statute, to enable the magistrates to act in the case.

I am, &c.,

H. WADDINGTON.

The MAYOR of *Liverpool*.

The Mayor of Liverpool to the Secretary of State.

[Telegram.]

LIVERPOOL, *Strand Station*, January 20, 1863.

Just received the following report on your letter of the 17th. Ship in the river, but a very heavy gale blowing; it is very probable she cannot get out to-day. I wait your instructions.

LIVERPOOL CONSTABULARY FORCE,
Central Police Office, January 20, 1863.

Detective officers Laycock and Patrick have the honor to report, for the information of Major Greig, head constable, relative to a communication from Sir George Grey, home secretary, to his worship the mayor of Liverpool, touching the Georgiana, supposed to be fitting out at Liverpool for the use of the Confederate States:

That they made strict and private inquiry, and found that the above named vessel was built at Glasgow, and came direct from that port to Liverpool. She left the London graving dock on Thursday last, and removed to the Bramley Moore dock, where she took in cargo, consisting of six hundred cases of brandy, about fifty chests and half chests of tea, six bales woolen goods, a quantity of miscellaneous goods, and medicine. During the time she was taking in cargo it was, in the usual way,

inspected by officers of her Majesty's customs. The customs authorities assert that no guns or ammunition were put on board, and she does not appear in any way fitted out for warlike purposes. She is only a screw steamer of 407 tons register. Her crew consists of the captain and forty hands, who were shipped by Messrs. J. & F. Johnson, merchants, Walmer buildings, Water street. They have shipped from Liverpool to Nassau; afterwards to any port in the United States or British America, the voyage not to exceed two years. She went into the river Mersey on Saturday last, and had she not lost one of her anchors she would, before now, have proceeded to sea.

The agents are Messrs. A. E. Byrne & Co., Tower Buildings, Liverpool.
F. J. GREIG, H. O.

The Town Clerk of Liverpool to the Secretary of State, Home Department.

[Telegram.]

Since the mayor's message sent, I have seen the American consul at this port, who says he has information that small arms are on board, and perhaps rifled cannon; that the ship has two port-holes on each side, and there are rings in the deck for the gun ropes; that the crew consists of nearly fifty men, and more officers than usual, and double crew of engineers and their assistants.

The Mayor of Liverpool to Mr. Waddington.

TOWN HALL, Liverpool, January 21, 1863.

SIR: I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of yesterday's date, and to inform you that I caused further inquiries to be made as to reliable evidence of any intention to fit out the Georgiana as a vessel of war for the use of the Confederate States of America, or to be used otherwise contrary to the provisions of the "Act 59, George III, chapter 69."

The town clerk having informed me of the statements made to him by the American consul yesterday, which were communicated to you by his telegram after I had dispatched mine, I directed the chief superintendent of the detective department, with another officer of great intelligence, previously employed in this case, to wait upon the consul this morning, and to inform him that the authorities here were prepared to give every possible assistance to prevent any infringement of the act above quoted, but that the magistrates could not act unless upon precise evidence sufficient to satisfy them that an offense had been committed against the law. He stated to the superintendent that he had obtained certain information, which, however, he could not disclose, the same having been given to him in confidence; but he suggested that an examination of the ship should be made, for the purpose of ascertaining whether she was in any way fitted for a vessel of war, and especially in relation to ports for guns having been made here, and rings placed in the deck for the gun-ropes. I directed that the officers should visit the ship, but she this day proceeded to sea. Our police have made every inquiry, especially in reference to the points mentioned by the consul. They verbally report to me that they found the ship was built in great haste in Glasgow; that she came here in a very unfinished state; that the ports were made here, inasmuch as it was found that in

a heavy sea, from her great speed, much water would be shipped, and that these ports were intended for the escape of such water; and that she is very slightly built, and is not calculated to carry any armament, or to be used as a fighting ship; and they are of opinion that she is built for speed only, and very probably intended to run the blockade, if possible.

I have directed the officers to communicate to the American consul the information they have obtained.

I have, &c.,

R. O. GARDNER, *Mayor*.

H. WADDINGTON, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

The examination of Mr. James Webb, acting assistant surveyor for rum-maging clearing vessels, and seeing that the out-door officers who perform the water-guard duty correctly and faithfully discharge the same.

I have been in the service of the customs nearly twenty-seven years. I entered the service as a tide-waiter. Yesterday morning (Sunday) the surveyor, Mr. Morgan, called at my house (for it was my turn off duty) about 7.30, and asked me if I knew where the Georgiana was lying. I told him she had gone into the river on Saturday, and was then lying in the Mersey, opposite the watch-house. I then accompanied him towards the boarding station at the Prince's dock pier-head. As we were going down we met the captain, Davidson. He said he was going to the ship. Mr. Morgan then desired me to go to the ship in the river, while he turned back with the captain to see his papers. I went on board the Georgiana at about 9.30 a. m. She was about half a mile off the great landing stage. I went on board and had the hatches removed in order to examine the cargo. She was not above half full. She appeared to have a quantity of tea and bale goods on board; also, oil, tallow, and provisions, which I saw. There was no objection made to my going into any part of the vessel. I have seen the vessel several times before, both while she lay in the Sandon docks and in the graving dock. She is an ordinary iron screw steamer, *i. e.*, not built stronger than the ordinary merchant vessel. She is brig-rigged, and not fore and aft. She has no port-holes, and no places fitted for mounting guns. It is impossible that she could have port-holes without a total change in the bulwarks, there being no support to sustain the recoil of the guns. There were eighteen or nineteen iron plates on board, lying on the top of the cargo; they were of the same thickness as the hull of the vessel—that is, the ordinary thickness for merchant vessels.

I am satisfied, from the construction, general fittings, and adaptations of the ship, that she is in no way fitted for a privateer. I specially noticed the vessel after she came to the port, and on her arrival made several inquiries about her, and so satisfied was I then, and still am, that she was not intended for warlike purposes, that I did not consider myself called upon to make any report concerning her.

J. WEBB.

Signed and declared before me, at the custom-house, Liverpool, this nineteenth day of January, 1863.

S. PRICE EDWARDS, *Collector*.

Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, January 26, 1863.

MY LORD: I have the honor to acknowledge the reception of your notes of the 17th, 18th, 19th, and 24th of this month, together with certain papers relating to the case of the Georgiana. I return the manifest and copy of the victualling bill, as requested.

The Georgiana has departed on her voyage, and therefore I deem it unnecessary to pursue the subject further. But I regret to say that I am not entirely convinced of the incorrectness of the information upon which my representation of the 16th instant was based. After the experience had in the instances of the Oreto and of No. 290, I hope I may be pardoned for distrusting the result of any investigation arrived at in similar cases at Liverpool when conducted by the same parties. On the other hand, the further evidence which I have obtained since writing my note tends to confirm me in the impression first received, that the vessel was pierced for four port-holes at Liverpool, and she sailed carrying both cannon and small arms, as well as iron plates in her hold, to be hereafter put on to protect her sides. Time will show which view of the subject is the true one. In any event I feel safe in asking of your lordship the favor to take such measures as may at least prevent the possibility of completing the outfit and armament of this vessel at Nassau, if such a proceeding should prove to have been contemplated.

I pray your lordship to accept the assurances of the highest consideration with which I have the honor to be, my lord, your most obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *January 27, 1863.*

SIR: With reference to my letter of the 24th instant, I have the honor to transmit to you, for your information, a copy of a further report which has been received through the mayor of Liverpool from the head constable of that borough, relative to the screw steamer Georgiana.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

Report of Major Greig, head constable.

LIVERPOOL CONSTABULARY FORCE,
Central Police Office, January 22, 1863.

Detective Officers Laycock and Patrick have the honor to report, for the information of Major Greig, head constable, relative to a communication from Sir George Grey, home secretary, to his worship the mayor

of Liverpool, respecting the screw steamer *Georgiana*, said to have been fitted out for the service of the Confederate States of America—

That from further inquiries made, officers found that she sailed yesterday from the river Mersey, between 11 o'clock a. m. and 12 noon.

Officers afterwards went to Messrs. Grayson's ship-building yard, Regent road, they having executed the repairs of the above vessel while in the Sandon graving dock. Saw Mr. Brough, their foreman, who superintended the work, who stated that he had pierced two port-holes on each side of the vessel, which would answer when she shipped much water, or for guns for her own protection.

He also stated that she is so slightly built that, if a gun was fired on board of her, it would shake her from stem to stern.

She was built at a very light expense for the purpose of running the blockade. She has neither gun swivels nor ring-bolts on deck for firing cannon.

J. J. GREIG, *H. O.*

Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

No. 531.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 28, 1863.

SIR: I herewith inclose the copy of a letter of yesterday addressed to this department by Samuel Whiting, esq., late consul of the United States at Nassau, with a copy of the papers which accompanied it, relative to the arrival at that port of the piratical steamer *Georgiana*, which entered it on the 27th ultimo, under the pretext that she was a private armed merchant vessel, although the fact is notorious that she was built, manned, armed and equipped in England for the purpose of preying upon our national commerce, as the *Alabama* has been doing.

You will present this case to the consideration of Earl Russell with a request that it may receive the early attention of her Majesty's government.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

[For inclosures see dispatch No. 374 of Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward, dated April 16, 1863, *post.*]

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

[Extract.]

No. 368.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, April 9, 1863.

SIR: * * * * *

I am glad to learn that the *Georgiana* was driven ashore, and I hope the statement that she was destroyed is true. The accounts received from Nassau of her condition, both on arrival and departure, prove the correctness of the representations of her character made by me to this government. I mention this the more that Lord Russell has, upon one occasion since, alluded to the subject in a manner to show that he thought I had been for that time deceived.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANÇOIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward.

No. 374.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, April 16, 1863.

SIR: I transmit herewith a copy of a note addressed by me to Lord Russell, in obedience to the instructions contained in your dispatch (No. 531) of the 28th of March. I was glad to have the opportunity to do so, as the evidence verified the representations heretofore made by me of the character of the Georgiana, and exposes the nature of the reports from Liverpool to the foreign office on the same subject. I had reason to believe that his lordship considered me, in this case, at least, to have made a mistake. Thus far, I think, I can say that all the latter evidence received sustains, in every instance, the allegations that have been made. Fortunately, the Georgiana is put out of the question as a mischief-maker.

A copy of Lord Russell's acknowledgment is appended.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

*Mr. Adams to Earl Russell.*LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, April 14, 1863.

MY LORD: I have been instructed to lay before your lordship copies of a correspondence transmitted to me from Washington relative to the arrival of the steamer Georgiana at Nassau. It appears by these papers that she appeared and was received at that port in the singular guise of an armed British merchant vessel, although, from the evidence which your lordship was pleased to furnish to me from Liverpool, she was not represented as enacting any such part in that harbor. I have now every reason to believe that the information upon which I had the honor to base my representation of the character and purposes of that vessel was, in all essential particulars, correct.

Happily for the interests of both countries, this cause of complaint and irritation has been disposed of, in a summary way, in advance of any production of mischief. I wish I could have it in my power to make the same announcement in other cases to which I have been under the painful necessity to draw your lordship's notice.

I pray your lordship to accept the assurances of the highest consideration with which I have the honor to be, my lord, your most obedient servant,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL, &c., &c., &c.

*Mr. Whiting to Mr. Seward.*WASHINGTON, *March 27, 1863.*

SIR: I have the honor to inclose to you herewith my letters of protest to his excellency Governor Bayley, of Bahama, in regard to the arrival

at Nassau, N. P., on the 27th February last, of the armed privateer Georgiana, and his excellency's reply thereto. I also inclose a copy of my letter addressed to Captain Kennedy, of her Britannic Majesty's steamer Challenge, on the same subject, and a copy of his reply.

The captain of the Georgiana, Davidson, and his mate, Wilson, came to New York in the British Queen last Saturday, avowedly *en route* for Liverpool, when they said, openly, that a more formidable cruiser than any yet in the service of the rebels was awaiting them at Liverpool, where they expected to join her and bring her out to Nassau.

The day before I left Nassau, the "na" was painted out from the Georgiana's name, thus leaving her the Georgia. The new vessel, Captain Davidson said, was to be called the South Carolina; and he also said she was to be heavily armed, and that she was a very fleet vessel.

I have the honor to be, sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant,
SAMUEL WHITING,
Late U. S. Consul at Nassau, N. P.

HON. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Whiting to Governor Bayley.

NASSAU, BAHAMAS, February 28, 1863.

May it please your excellency, I have the honor to inform your excellency that I have this day received information from a consular passenger who arrived here on the steamer Georgiana, that that vessel, now in port, is armed with two rifled cannon, and otherwise equipped for war-like purposes.

I have to request your excellency will take such immediate steps to detain this vessel, until the evidence may be put in proper form, as are necessary in such a case.

I have the honor to be your excellency's most obedient servant,
SAMUEL WHITING, U. S. Consul.

Mr. Nesbitt to Mr. Whiting.

COLONIAL SECRETARY'S OFFICE,
Nassau, March 2, 1863.

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter dated the 28th ultimo, relative to the steamer Georgiana, addressed to his Excellency the governor.

I am now instructed by his excellency to acquaint you that the fort adjutant, who was instructed to board the Georgiana, has done so, and reported to the effect that she is only an armed merchant vessel.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
O. A. NESBITT, Col. Secretary.

JAMES WHITING, Esq.,
U. S. Consul, &c., &c., Nassau.

Mr. Whiting to Captain Kennedy.

UNITED STATES CONSULATE,
Nassau, N. P., March 20, 1863.

SIR: From information received from Charles Zink, who arrived at this port as a passenger in the steamship Georgiana, I have reason to

believe that vessel, now lying at the entrance of the harbor, is fitted and equipped for the purpose of committing hostilities against the United States.

She is now a British vessel, and has, or had when she arrived here, two rifled cannon mounted on her deck, and on her voyage from Tenerife to this port the crew were exercised in firing them. She has also for the crew's use in her armory, revolver pistols, rifles, shot, &c., and has ammunition and a large crew which it is intended to double.

My government has informed me of the character of this vessel some time past, and as I have no doubt that she is violating the provisions of the foreign enlistment act within the jurisdiction of this government, I have to request that you, being the only British naval officer in command here, will at once board that vessel and make an examination of her, so that if, on inquiry, she should be found to be of the character shadowed out, she may be seized and brought before the admiralty court for an examination.

I am, sir, your most obedient servant,

SAMUEL WHITING,
United States Consul.

Captain KENNEDY,
Her Majesty's Ship Challenger, Nassau.

Captain Kennedy to Mr. Whiting.

HER MAJESTY'S SHIP CHALLENGER,
Nassau, March 2, 1863.

SIR: In answer to your letter of March the 2d, 1863, I have to inform you that as the Georgiana is within the port of Nassau, you must apply to the governor to order the examination you require.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

J. KENNEDY, *Captain.*

The UNITED STATES CONSUL at Nassau, N. P.

Earl Russell to Mr. Adams.

FOREIGN OFFICE, April 15, 1863.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of yesterday's date, inclosing copies of papers transmitted to you from Washington, respecting the case of the Georgiana.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

RUSSELL.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Esq., &c., &c., &c.

**This preservation photocopy
was made and hand bound at BookLab, Inc.
in compliance with copyright law. The paper,
Weyerhaeuser Cougar Opaque Natural,
meets the requirements of ANSI/NISO
Z39.48-1992 (Permanence of Paper).**



Austin 1994



3 2044 022 666 978



